

stating opposition to, and requesting that no legislation be enacted containing the principle of, compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

891. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., urging approval of the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending before the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

892. Also, petition of Mrs. Effa K. Collings and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

893. Also, petition of O. L. Williams, president, Tampa Townsend Club, No. 1, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, in hours of perplexity and confusion we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee. With swift and unpredictable events tumbling upon us without warning in a violent and chaotic world, O Thou God of the changing years, in a still moment like this as we bow at our noontide altar, may a holy hush within our spirits whisper words of courage and fortitude and fidelity. In these days of decision and destiny may we not miss the things belonging to our peace and to the peace of the world. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Lucas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1152) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 195. An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes;

H. R. 623. An act for the relief of Sadako Takagi;

H. R. 656. An act for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 703. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Otegin Foxworth;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of the Central Bank, a California corporation, as assignee of John C. Williams, an individual operating under the fictitious name and trade style of Central Machine Works, of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Hoy C. Wong;

H. R. 1173. An act for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters;

H. R. 1297. An act for the relief of Alvin G. Patton;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard;

H. R. 1619. An act for the relief of St. Elizabeth Hospital, Yakima, Wash., and others;

H. R. 1620. An act for the relief of Robert E. Bridge and Leslie E. Ensign;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Bates;

H. R. 1790. An act to restore certain land in Alaska to the public domain and to authorize its sale to Ford J. Dale, of Fairbanks, Alaska;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Col. Wlodzimierz Onacewicz;

H. R. 2588. An act to confirm title in V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard to certain lands in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.;

H. R. 2850. An act for the relief of Denise Simeon Boutant;

H. R. 3127. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of Jacob Gross, a minor;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 3320. An act for the relief of Ignacio Colon Cruz;

H. R. 3321. An act for the relief of Gloria Esther Diaz, Lydia Velez, and Gladys Prieto;

H. R. 3471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sarah J. Miller;

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird;

H. R. 3720. An act for the relief of Erwin F. Earl;

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns;

H. R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 4186. An act for the relief of Jan Liga;

H. R. 4307. An act for the relief of Ever Ready Supply Co. and Harold A. Dahlborg;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; and

H. R. 4559. An act for the relief of Louis Brown.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service considering pay and classification legislation be

permitted to meet this afternoon at 3 o'clock during the session of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee to hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senate has met after a recess, and before the Senator proceeds I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, submit routine matters, and ask to have insertions made in the RECORD without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide funds for the maintenance and care of veterans' memorial cemeteries in the Territory of Hawaii

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to provide \$40,000 annually for the maintenance and care of veterans' memorial cemeteries on each of the islands of the Territory of Hawaii, as follows:

Kauai	\$10,000
Hawaii	10,000
Maui	10,000
Molokai	10,000

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, and to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 4th day of May A. D. 1949.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to undertake the development of water storage facilities for the production of hydroelectric power and for the irrigation of certain upland areas at Waimea, County of Kauai

"Whereas in the upper land area of Waimea, near Kokee, County of Kauai, there is approximately 15,000 acres of land which

would be suitable for agricultural purposes if irrigated; and

"Whereas there is sufficient water available, amounting to a flow of nearly 2,000,000 gallons per day, for irrigating such lands but lack of water storage facilities prevent its use for controlled irrigation; and

"Whereas there have been studies completed showing the feasibility and practicality of constructing reservoirs and of providing irrigation for such lands; and

"Whereas it is also both feasible and practical to include as part of the water storage facilities and irrigation project facilities for generating hydroelectric power: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to appropriate adequate funds for and to provide for the undertaking of the development of facilities for the impounding of water in the upper land area of Waimea, near Kokee, County of Kauai, such water to be used for generating hydroelectric power and for irrigating land in the area. It is requested that included in the project be three reservoirs to be designated, to have the approximate capacities, and to be located in the County of Kauai, as follows:

"1. Kawaikoi reservoir, to be located below the junction of the east fork and the north fork of the Kawaikoi stream, at an elevation of approximately 3,431 feet and to have a capacity of at least 2,400,000,000 gallons of water; and

"2. Kokee reservoir, to be located near Kokee, at an elevation of approximately 3,500 feet, and to have a capacity of at least 140,000,000 gallons of water to be derived from the waters of the Kokee stream, the Noe stream, and the Waikeke stream; and

"3. Kanaloahuluhulu reservoir, to be located north and west of Kokee at an elevation of approximately 3,620 feet, and to provide storage facilities for at least 280,000,000 gallons of water naturally accumulating in that area, which water is to be subsequently discharged into the Waikeke stream.

"Sec. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 29th day of April A. D. 1949.

*"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation in regard to the stoppage or curtailment of sea-borne commerce between ports of the continental United States and ports of the Territory of Hawaii due to labor disputes

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, not being self-sufficient, and being located over 2,000 miles from the continental United States, and deriving much of its food and other essential supplies therefrom, as well as shipping much of its products thereto, is largely dependent upon sea-borne commerce between ports of the continental United States and ports of the said Territory for such food and essential supplies, as well as for the transportation for such products; and

"Whereas such commerce has been stopped or greatly curtailed from time to time, by reason of labor disputes between employers,

on the one hand, and labor unions representing maritime workers or harbor workers, on the other hand, as a result of which labor disputes the economy of the said Territory has been injured, its productive effort has been damaged, and its people have suffered from protracted shortages of food and other essential supplies; and

"Whereas the best interests of the said Territory and its people are served by the prompt and orderly settlement of the aforesaid labor disputes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America enacted the Federal Railway Act (title 45, U. S. C., ch. 8) for the prompt and orderly settlement of labor disputes between railway employers and railway employees, but has enacted no similar legislation for the settlement of labor disputes between the aforesaid employers and the aforesaid maritime workers and harbor workers, although both classes of labor disputes equally affect the public interest and the health, welfare, and safety of the people: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation similar, in principle, to the said Federal Railway Labor Act for the prompt and orderly settlement of labor disputes between employers, on the one hand, and maritime employees on ships engaging in commerce between ports of the continental United States and ports of the Territory of Hawaii and harbor workers in said ports, on the other hand, to the end, that such commerce will not be stopped or curtailed, and all such disputes will be settled as promptly and orderly as possible.

"Sec. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Labor, to the United States Maritime Commission and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of May A. D. 1949.

*"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Edward R. Burke, counsel, Hawaii Statehood Commission, of Washington, D. C., relating to statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Bellaire, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A paper in the nature of a memorial from the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners of Washington, D. C., signed by Chester C. Thompson, president, remonstrating against the action of the United States Civil Service Commission in reducing the number of hearing examiners employed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE— RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference House Resolution No. 42 of the One Hundred and Fifteenth General Assembly of the State of Delaware, petitioning the Congress to refrain from imposing upon the citizens any form of compulsory health insurance.

The resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See text of resolution printed in full when presented by the Vice President on May 16, 1949, p. 6204, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 56 citizens of Lewes, Del., in support of H. R. 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverages over the radio.

The petition was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FEDERAL REGIONAL OR VALLEY AUTHORITIES—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution unanimously adopted by the National Wildlife Federation at its annual meeting on March 6 here in Washington. This resolution, representing the viewpoint of over 5,000 sportsmen and conservationists in the United States, opposes formation of any additional Federal, regional, or valley authorities. According to David A. Aylward, president of the federation, its membership believes that it would be better to handle the Nation's resources through interstate compact rather than further Federal valley authorities. There is, of course, a considerable amount of legislation now pending in the Congress for setting up additional valley or regional authorities, and I believe that the congressional committees evaluating this legislation should, while reviewing all of the facts in the matter, consider the viewpoint of the Nation's conservationists.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the National Wildlife Federation resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE IDAHO WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Whereas the National Wildlife Federation favors the maximum feasible conservation of America's natural resources; and

Whereas we believe that the creation of any Federal Valley Authority would interfere with the inherent rights of States in the management and conservation of their natural resources; and

Whereas there are now before the Congress of the United States bills to create additional valley authorities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, a national organization in regular annual meeting assembled at Washington, D. C., March 6, 1949, is unalterably opposed to the creation of any additional Federal regional or valley authorities as being unjustified, unnecessary, and a dangerous departure from our American form of Government.

PRO-COMMUNIST SPEECH BY HONOLULU
(HAWAII) HIGH-SCHOOL GIRL—LETTER
AND RESOLUTION OF HAWAII EDUCA-
TION ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter which I have just received from James R. McDonough, executive secretary of the Hawaii Education Association. This letter submits to me a resolution unanimously adopted by the Hawaii Education Association in convention assembled on April 14, 1949. The purport of the resolution is to declare that the pro-Communist speech made by a school girl in Honolulu, to which I called the attention of the Senate some weeks ago, does not represent the attitude of the student body at this particular high school.

I am very glad to have this assurance, and I am happy to comply with the request that this resolution be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred, together with the accompanying papers, including the list of signatures to the petition, may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAWAII EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Honolulu, Hawaii, U. S. A., May 4, 1949.
The Honorable PATRICK McCARRAN,
Senator from Nevada, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: I respectfully submit herewith a resolution unanimously adopted by the Hawaii Education Association in convention assembled April 14, 1949.

Truly yours,

JAMES R. McDONOUGH,
Executive Secretary.

Whereas the action of Senator PATRICK McCARRAN in reading into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an ill-advised speech on communism delivered by a 16-year-old school girl on the assigned topic, The Russian Problem, in a contest sponsored by the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Senator's remarks upon this occasion, appear calculated to cast doubts upon Hawaii's teachers and students; and

Whereas the declaration framed by the student body of Kaimuki High School, dated April 8, 1949, which was read on the floor of the Territorial Senate on Wednesday morning, April 13, 1949, a copy of which is appended to this resolution, expresses what we believe to be the sincere convictions of the youth of Hawaii; and

Whereas the Territorial Senate voted to send to Congress this declaration and the remarks of Senators Herbert K. H. Lee and Eugene S. Capellas, Sr., with the request that it be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Hawaii Education Association in convention assembled this 14th day of April 1949 heartily endorse the statement by the Kaimuki High School students and the comments by the Territorial senators; and be it further

Resolved, That the Hawaii Education Association add its request to that of the Territorial Senate that this statement be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, supporting this request with the assertion of its confidence in the loyalty, patriotism, and

Americanism of Hawaii's public-school teachers and pupils; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to Senator McCARRAN.

HAWAII EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

Adopted April 14, 1949.

KAIMUKI HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT
GOVERNMENT,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 8, 1949.

DECLARATION

Because we are students of Kaimuki High School and loyal American citizens devoted to the American way of life;

Because there appears to be some damage to our school reputation because of a student speech given in a school assembly in November 1948, which speech did not and does not represent our school or our beliefs and attitudes;

Because the ideas of communism play no part in our lives, and any assumption to the contrary is unfair, unjust, and with no basis in fact;

Because Kaimuki High School has been on record since 1947-48 as favoring statehood;

Because the speech and publicity given to it may have injured the cause of statehood for Hawaii;

Therefore, we the undersigned representatives of the student body of Kaimuki High School respectfully submit the following declaration:

We resent and we reject all implications that communism has any hold whatsoever on the students of Kaimuki High School, and we reaffirm our undivided loyalty to the United States of America and our devotion to the American way of life.

And we therefore are sending copies of this declaration to the following: The Honorable Ingram M. Stainback, Governor of Hawaii; the Honorable Wilfred C. Tsukiyama, president of the Senate, Territory of Hawaii; the Honorable Hiram L. Fong, speaker of the House of Representatives, Territory of Hawaii; the Honorable Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States of America and President of the Senate of the United States of America; the Honorable Samuel Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America; the Honorable Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; Dr. W. Harold Loper, superintendent of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii; Mr. Edward N. Sylva, chairman, board of commissioners of public instruction, Territory of Hawaii; Mr. Julius Krug, Secretary, Department of the Interior, of the United States of America; Mr. Robert M. Faulkner, supervising principal of Honolulu schools.

Henry Au Hoy, Student Government President; Walter Ito, Student Government Vice President; Nancy Oyama, Student Government Secretary; James Nohara, Student Government Treasurer; Robert Sasaki, Sergeant-at-Arms; Fujiko Zukeran, Inter School Council Chairman; Yuriiko Hisano, Room 7 Representative; Alice Sakai, Room 19 Representative; Helen Higa, Room 38 Representative; Thelma Kaneshiro, Room 9 Representative; Dorothy Haisuka, Room 15 Representative; Lillian Okuhara, Room 14B Representative; Sadie Ono, Chairman, Archives Committee; Edna Yamamoto, Chairman, Assembly Board Committee; Helen Fuchise, Room 4 Representative; Robert Freitas, Police Chief; William Kaneshiro, Representative, Library; Leighton Anderson, Room 7 Representative; George Gasper, Cafeteria E

Representative; Joyce Matsuda, Room 11 Representative; Lottie Kobayashi, Room 9 Representative; James Hare, Room 26 Representative; Rickey Hamasaki, Junior Class President; Herman Ping, Room 34 Representative; Jean Kashiwamura, Cafeteria K Representative; Patsy Minatodani, Room 21 Representative; Jan Jo, Editor—Annual; Gail Omura, Identification Bureau Chairman; Mabel L. Kam, Handbook Committee Chairman; Nancy Onaga, Newspaper Editor; Harold Abe, Room 31 Representative; M. Freitas, Room 16 Representative; Oi Wun Young, Room 21 Representative; Katherine Niau, Room 18 Representative; Violet Oki, Room 17 Representative; James Kura-shige, Room 24 Representative; Veronica Lim, Room 24 Representative; Grace Oshima, Room 24 Representative; Rebecca Goodness, Junior Class Adviser; Cathryn M. Irvine, Senior Class Adviser.

THE SPANISH MUDDLE—EDITORIAL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion recently, on the floor of this body, with respect to our attitude toward Spain.

In that connection, I hold in my hand an article from the Paris edition of the London Daily Mail, dated Friday, April 22, the title of which is "The Spanish Muddle," and the author of which is Sir Duff Cooper, former British Ambassador to France.

Because I believe this article will be of special interest to many Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPANISH MUDDLE—WHY TREAT SPAIN
WORSE THAN OUR EX-ENEMIES?—BRITAIN
SHOULD ABANDON INDEFENSIBLE POLICY

(By Sir Duff Cooper, former British
Ambassador to France)

The political situation is subject to perpetual change. Men who refuse to recognize the changes that take place are doomed to failure. Those who in 1949 adhere obstinately to a policy that was defensible in 1945 are the stupidest sort of diehards. They fail to understand that in foreign affairs a complete revolution has taken place in 4 years.

When the war ended, Britons of all parties were anxious for continued close collaboration with their Russian ally. Today men of all parties, except Communists and crypto-Communists, have reluctantly come to the conclusion that such collaboration is, at present, impossible.

It is the Russians who have driven them to that conclusion and who, in doing so, have created a gang of police states, each ruled by minority governments, who defy the principles of the United Nations, who are arming in defiance of the peace treaties they have signed, and whose attitude constitutes a menace to the peace of the world.

To meet this menace the free nations are wisely pursuing two methods. They are forming a union of the powers of western Europe, and are concluding a pact with their great ally on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. At the same time this great ally, in order to prevent her friends in Europe from collapsing under the strain of postwar economic conditions, is extending toward them generous financial assistance.

NEVER INVITED

The following, therefore, are now the four main features of the situation—Communist

menace, western union, Atlantic Pact, and Marshall aid. Four years ago the first of these was not generally recognized as existing, and the other three did not exist. So the change in the situation is immense, and the change in our attitude toward it should be commensurable.

In the lists of nations belonging to the western union and the Atlantic Pact, and in that of those receiving Marshall aid, there is one name conspicuously absent. Spain has never been invited to associate herself with her neighbors, and although she is in dire financial straits, no helping hand has been extended toward her.

Whenever it is suggested that there should be some alteration in the anti-Spanish policy adopted 4 years ago, Britain's prim, little leftist politicians purse up their lips in disapproval, like that of maiden aunts toward the bad girl of the family, and exclaim: "Spain! Oh, no, we never mention her."

In more sensible circles there is a growing uneasiness about this attitude. To nurse a grudge is foolish in an individual—it is unpardonable in the government of a great country. To send a member of society to Coventry is schoolboy justice, and should be abandoned by those who have left the school-room.

Britain says that it is not the Spanish people but their government with whom she is angry; yet, it is the people who are suffering and the government who are gaining as the result of Britain's policy. Heaven forbid that Britain should seek to appeal to the Spanish people over the head of their government, that elementary political blunder, which President Wilson made in the case of Italy 30 years ago, but Britain should make some attempt to explain her policy to Spaniards, and she cannot explain it without changing it, for as it stands it is inexplicable.

Her whole policy toward Spain is based upon dislike of her present government. That Britain has grounds for her dislike may be granted, but whether such dislike constitutes in itself a sufficiently sound basis for the policy of one country toward another must be questioned.

PROUD PEOPLE

If we are to succeed in the formation of unions and pacts comprehensive of many nations, it can hardly be expected that each one of those nations will entirely approve of the form of government existing in each one of the others. It is even possible that Britain's Government may arouse no particular enthusiasm among some of her closest friends.

Both great political parties in the United States detest socialism, yet Britain's Socialist government demands and obtains unfailing sympathy and assistance from those who deplore its principles. The British Government would be outraged, even those of us who do not support it would be deeply offended, if the Americans were to say one morning: "If you wish to retain our friendship, you must change your government." Yet this is precisely what Britain is saying every morning to Spain.

The Spaniards are a very proud people. They are not going to make excuses, nor to ask Britain questions, but there are many good excuses they could make which would clarify the situation, and many questions they could ask which would be hard to answer.

RESISTED THREAT

Admitting that their attitude in the war was more friendly to Britain's foes than to Britain, they might remind Britons that they had just emerged from a civil war in which they had lost more killed than Great Britain lost either in the Second or in the First World War; that Hitler, triumphant, was standing on their frontiers, using all the pressure at his command to persuade them to come into the war on his side, and promising them

Gibraltar and much else beside as their reward.

Yet they resisted both the threat and the bribe, and remained neutral, so that we learn from the recently published official papers of Ciano how the Germans were complaining in the fateful year of 1940 of the lack of co-operation from Spain, and comparing it unfavorably with the valuable support they were receiving from Russia.

Spaniards cannot believe it possible that they should be thought to have behaved worse toward the Allies during the war than either Germany or Italy. Yet they are being worse treated today.

They see the Allies making gigantic efforts to feed the Germans and yet they are hungrier than the Germans, but nobody ever thinks of feeding them. Italy has been forgiven, as though she had never been guilty, and is a highly respected member of the western union and of the Atlantic Pact.

Spaniards know that we do not like dictatorships. Nor do they. But they know also that there is a dictatorship in Portugal, and they suspect that the methods of the Turkish Government are not always strictly democratic. Yet these facts have not, fortunately, interfered with Britain's friendly relations with these countries.

They have been told that the ambassadors of the democracies were withdrawn from Madrid because it was considered that Spanish political offenders had been treated with excessive severity. Yet they have seen the hero, Petkov judicially murdered in Bulgaria and the saintly Mindszenty unjustly condemned to lifelong imprisonment in Hungary, and they know that Britain is still represented by fully accredited diplomatists in both countries.

These are some of the questions that Spaniards would be justified in asking Britain, and that Britain would find it very difficult to answer. They might also add that, if Britain is afraid that she may have to fight communism, they have already fought it, and defeated it—a fact that should entitle them to some consideration.

TWO ATTITUDES

It is high time that Britain abandoned a policy, for which there may have been some justification 4 years ago, but which is indefensible today. The main objective of the new policy should be to bring Spain back to the community of nations, and the first step toward that objective should be the appointment of ambassadors.

There are only two attitudes which a sensible man can adopt toward others. Either he must be polite or he must refuse to speak to them. No sensible man would adopt the policy of being perpetually rude.

To be represented by a chargé d'affaires and to refuse to appoint an ambassador is a policy of incivility. It may be permissible as a temporary expedient, but when it is prolonged over a period of years it becomes ridiculous. It is the worst of all policies to adopt toward the most courteous of nations.

When the ambassadors have been appointed and when they have got into touch with the Spanish Government, as only ambassadors can do, they should report to their own governments as to the next steps that should be taken in order to arrive at the end desired.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 858. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the longshore, stevedoring, building, and construction industries; with amendments (Rept. No. 402).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 18, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 460. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.;

S. 461. An act to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

S. 812. An act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.;

S. 1185. An act to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes; and

S. 1704. An act to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Roderick Murray and Paul D. Pedersen, for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

Ardell B. Colyar, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 1875, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TYDINGS also introduced Senate bill 1876, to provide pay, allowances, retirement, and survivor benefits for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1877. A bill providing for the conveyance of the former Fort Phillip Kearney Military Reservation to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1878. A bill for the relief of W. L. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1879. A bill to allow an exclusion from the gross income of an employee for income-tax purposes of payments, made by his employer, of premiums on not to exceed \$10,000 of term insurance on the employee's life; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1880, to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic

lic of Liberia, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1881. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1882. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1932, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1883. A bill for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1884. A bill for the relief of Rev. Lambros Economakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1885. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of the State of California for reimbursement for moneys advanced and expended in aid of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. McFarland):

S. 1886. A bill to permit shipment by mail of live scorpions to be used for medical research purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. Hayden):

S. 1887. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property for the use and benefit of the Colorado River Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1888. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes. In view of the fact that the bill will provide authorizations for \$623,125,682, I shall take the liberty of reading a short letter, so that it may appear in the RECORD and put Senators on notice, because the projects are scattered all over the United States, as well as in Canada and in our possessions. I shall first read the letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the reading of the letter? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. The letter reads:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 17, 1949.

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to proceed, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the appropriation of necessary funds for the immediate and critical housing and public-works requirements of the National Military Establishment.

The proposed bill consists of four titles. The first three titles enumerate the projects sought to be authorized for each of the services, grouped according to specific station or locality. Title IV contains general authority for the three Secretaries to acquire lands or interests therein by donation, purchase, or otherwise, in connection with the construction under the proposed bill, provides that appropriations may be made available until expended and authorizes the granting of contract authority in lieu of appropriations.

Sections 404 and 405 of the bill have been included therein as a result of Bureau of the Budget review of the legislation. Section 404 would limit the net floor area of the family quarters authorized to 1,080 square feet per unit. Section 405 would provide a limit of not to exceed \$14,000 cost per family unit including kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services and all contingencies, as well as a limit of not to exceed \$2,500 per family unit for site development and outside utilities including architectural and engineering services and all contingencies.

There would be authorized under section 402 of this title, total appropriations of not to exceed \$623,125,682, including \$25,000,000 for emergency projects specifically authorized by the three Secretaries and \$14,529,000 for the special weapons project, with the balance allocated as follows:

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Inside continental United States.....	\$69,589,700	\$98,493,300	\$175,540,500
Outside continental United States.....	\$1,177,700	\$9,219,501	\$9,275,981

This bill has been developed as a result of the studies of Mr. Donald F. Carpenter, Chairman of the Munitions Board, who has been designated my personal representative in this matter. It represents the minimum requirement for authorizations which are immediately necessary and critical in the light of the over-all strategic considerations of the services as indicated in Mr. Carpenter's report to me. As my representative, Mr. Carpenter is available to furnish any information which may be desired and is authorized to act for me in this matter.

I earnestly request on behalf of the National Military Establishment favorable consideration of this legislation.

The National Military Establishment has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget and there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I understand the Senator from Maryland to say that the bulk of the money was for housing on or off the bases?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would not like to answer that question "yes" or "no," but I can say that a great deal of it is for housing. I have not recapitulated the figures so as to be able to give the Senator a positive answer to his question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator know whether the bill provides for the construction by the military itself of space to house military personnel, that is, single men, such as a barracks, or does it provide simply for the building of homes?

Mr. TYDINGS. It includes homes, family quarters, public utilities, and var-

ious other matters related to homes, as well as a great many critical projects such as, for example, construction of facilities for rocket development.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested primarily in the housing construction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that one of the items which quickly catches my eye—and I mention this because the Senator has presented to me the need for it many times before—is the Sioux Ordnance Depot in Nebraska. Family quarters and utilities to the extent of \$99,000 are provided at that one place. That is for the Army. There may be other Nebraska items in the bill. That is the thing the Senator and I have been discussing in part heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. So if I correctly understand the provisions of the bill, it contemplates that the military will construct these facilities either on or off the base, and they will be rented, I imagine, to the personnel under their allowances. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator's observation is accurate.

Mr. WHERRY. This is not a private enterprise housing bill. It provides money which the military itself expects to expend. The military itself will control the housing, will it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. The military may have private persons do the building, but the military will supervise the work.

Mr. WHERRY. The military will own it, and there will be no loans issued against it?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. This is a straight-out preparedness and critically needed list of projects, both in the field of housing and in the field of ranges, test laboratories, and the like.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire whether the bill provides for the construction of housing facilities at the Army air base at Great Falls, Mont., which has been in great need of a program of that kind for a number of years.

Mr. TYDINGS. The bill is so long, and contains so many provisions, it would take me a little while to find out. I will tell the Senator privately whether it contains that item in a moment.

Mr. MURRAY. If it contains provisions of that character it would influence me a great deal.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, for the information of Senators.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1875) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 101. The Secretary of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop military installations and facilities

by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Climatic testing facilities, air-to-ground rocket-firing research facilities, high explosives loading and disassembly facilities and compressor building for supersonic windtunnel; \$2,930,000.

Arlington Hall, Virginia: Extension between wings 1 and 2, building No. 450, extension of wing No. 1, building No. 450; \$94,000.

Army-Navy General Hospital, Arkansas: Ground storage water reservoir; \$65,000.

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Process laboratory, radiological "cold" laboratory, low temperature test chambers, experimental loading and filling building, test chamber for aerosols, radiological "hot" laboratory, protective equipment laboratory, explosion test chamber, collective protector and air filter laboratory, facilities for assembly of clusters and fire bombs, high pressure laboratory, storage building for radiological equipment laboratory for radiological defense school; \$2,861,000.

Army Receiving Station, La Plata, Md.: Family quarters and utilities barracks, receiving building, power house and garage; \$634,500.

Army Transmitting Station, District of Columbia Area: Improve roads, land acquisition, power facilities, power house and garage, telephone facilities, transmitter building, barracks, family quarters and utilities; \$1,285,500.

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Communications building; \$118,000.

Benicia Arsenal, Calif.: Improvements to water system; \$243,800.

Fort Benning, Ga.: Family quarters and utilities, repair shops, dispensary, magazines, storage facilities, administration building, gasoline station and pump house, central heating plant, obstacle and test course, testing pool, lavatory building, target house, range facilities; \$6,512,000.

Black Hills Ordnance Depot, S. Dak.: Family quarters and utilities, improvements to water system; \$249,000.

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Mechanical laboratory, X-ray laboratory, carbon disulfide storage tank, two gas cylinder storage buildings, two chemical storage buildings, storage igloo in ordnance area, components assembly building, fence, family quarters and utilities; \$1,024,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Family quarters and utilities; \$6,666,000.

Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y.: Fire protection of piers; \$150,000.

California Institute of Technology, California: Test cells, hazardous propellant storage, construction modification and relocation of facilities; \$685,000.

Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah: Family quarters and utilities, barracks; \$497,700.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Family quarters and utilities, civilian dormitory, decontamination facilities, munitions building, aerobiological building, basic science building, meteorological building, pilot plant for crop studies, surveillance building laboratory, storage facilities, maintenance shops; \$3,313,500.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Family quarters and utilities; \$924,000.

Frankford Arsenal, Pa.: Improvements to water system; \$127,000.

Camp Hood, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities, battalion motor park, highway bridge, improvements to water system; \$9,100,000.

Fort Jackson, S. C.: Family quarters and utilities; \$528,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Family quarters and utilities; \$924,000.

Camp Lee, Va.: Family quarters and utilities; \$3,135,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Family quarters and utilities, removal of structures and relocation of post office and finance building, telephone exchange building; \$4,793,000.

Lima Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Heat and power plant, connection with city water supply and utilities; \$290,000.

Malta Test Station, N. Y.: Additional garage space, additions to electrical distribution system; Quonset huts and platforms; fencing, drainage, roads, fire lanes and clearings, vehicle storage sheds, well, pump and water distributing system, addition to test structure No. 6, chemical test structure and test cells, oxygen pump and turbine test buildings, extension of nitrogen and oxygen gas lines to pits 1 and 2 and chemical pit, fire alarm system, increase storage for new type fuels, stockroom addition, extension engineering and laboratory building, water pipe wall for pits 3 and 4, addition to ram jet structure; \$840,000.

Marion Engineer Depot, Ohio: Sprinkler system, special storage facilities; \$533,000.

Midwest Chemical Depot, Ark.: Storage sheds; \$551,000.

Fort Monmouth, N. J.: Family quarters and utilities; \$3,069,000.

Muroc Air Force Base, Calif.: Improvement to range bombing facilities; \$144,000.

Murphy General Hospital, Mass.: Family quarters and utilities, land acquisition; \$241,000.

Navajo Ordnance Depot, Ariz.: Utilities for Navajo Village; \$225,000.

Oliver General Hospital, Ga.: Family quarters and utilities; \$396,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, N. J.: Construction of facilities for rocket development and test purposes and utilities (Loki project); \$601,000.

Princeton, N. J.: Acquisition of Rockefeller Institute Facilities for Chemical Corps research; \$3,000,000.

Redstone Arsenal (Huntsville), Ala.: Chemical laboratory and administration-engineer buildings and rocket motor test stand; engineer building, administration building, laboratory buildings; four rocket motor test stands; storage facilities; flight test range; nitroglycerin plant; two temperature conditioning buildings; modification of eight buildings; modification of one building for machine shop; expansion and modification of utilities, roads and fences; \$4,250,000.

For Riley, Kans.: Underground magazines, family quarters and utilities; \$143,000.

Rosford Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Fireproofing of warehouses; \$500,000.

St. Louis Medical Depot, Mo.: Modification of medical laboratory building; \$125,000.

Schenectady General Depot, N. Y.: Base maintenance shop building facilities and utilities; \$749,000.

Sharpe General Depot, Calif.: Equipment-processing building; \$184,900.

Fort Sheridan, Ill.: Beach-erosion protection; \$150,000.

Sierra Ordnance Depot, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; \$165,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Family quarters and utilities, control tower; \$660,000.

Sioux Ordnance Depot, Nebr.: Family quarters and utilities; \$99,000.

Tooele Ordnance Depot, Utah: Family quarters and utilities; \$132,000.

Two Rock Ranch, California: Family quarters and utilities; \$231,000.

Valley Forge General Hospital, Pa.: Family quarters and utilities, enlarge sewage collection and pumping facilities, acquisition of land (30 acres); \$435,000.

Vint Hill Farms, Virginia: Family quarters and utilities; \$759,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Family quarters and utilities; barracks, extension of field instrumentation, automotive-maintenance shops, fuel stations, improvements to airfield facilities, meteorological station, refrigeration and ice plant, utilities shops, storage facilities, extension of water-supply system, and electric-power system, and bachelor officers quarters; \$4,321,400.

Yuma Test Branch, Ariz.: Family quarters and utilities, barracks, cold-storage ice plant, and commissary; \$215,400.

SPECIAL WEAPONS PROJECT

Construction at classified installations; \$14,529,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaska: Survey Valdez pipe line; \$315,000. Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Petroleum terminal storage; \$6,800,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Ordnance shops, water intake, petroleum terminal storage and dock, design of 400-bed station hospital, water supply, warehouses, heat and power plant, water treatment, enlisted men's service club, outside utilities, bachelor officers quarters, barracks, family housing and utilities; \$46,720,000.

Whittier, Alaska: Outside utilities, central heat and power plant, composite bachelor housing, service and recreation building; \$12,645,700.

Okinawa: General depot facilities, road net, water-supply system; \$1,439,000.

Naha, Okinawa: Sewers including sewers at Machinato, ship basin; \$1,139,000.

Sukiran, Okinawa: Signal and telephone system, utilities, roads, site preparation, family quarters and utilities; \$11,305,000.

Heleman, Oahu, T. H.: Land acquisition, \$6,000.

St. Thomas, V. I.: San Jose project, \$808,000.

TITLE II

The Secretary of the Navy, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: Jet overhaul building and accessories; \$950,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, Anacostia, D. C.: Research laboratory building and accessories, correction of deficiencies to existing facilities; \$1,570,000.

Naval Engineering Experiment Station, Annapolis, Md.: Submarine propulsion test facility; \$2,000,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Bangor, Wash.: Mine assembly facilities, including buildings and accessory construction; \$1,000,000.

Naval Training School, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.: Combustion test and development facility; \$682,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Alter 24 inch variable pressure water tunnel, wind tunnel and associated facilities, completion of 3 meter wind tunnel, free surface test facility; \$2,344,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,765,500.

Naval Aviation Ordnance Test Station, Chincoteague, Va.: Family quarters and utilities, guided missile range and facilities; \$1,165,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chincoteague, Va.: Family quarters and utilities; \$346,500.

Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va.: Interior ballistics measurements building; \$410,000.

Naval Ordnance Aerophysics Laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex.: Addition to test chamber to increase capacity of wind tunnel and additional laboratory facilities; \$864,500.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.: Mine assembly facilities, including buildings and accessory construction; \$1,100,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Addition to main power plant, including boilers and accessory construction, conversion

of barracks to family quarters and utilities; \$1,575,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nev.: Additional water storage facilities; \$320,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif.: Morris Dam under water test facilities, static firing facilities for liquid fuels, aerodynamics ballistic track range, ballistic ground ranges and additional instrumentation for and modification of guided missile range, ballistics range facilities, family quarters and utilities; \$10,992,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Aircraft berthing, turning basin and approach channel, Mayport, Fla.; \$4,920,000.

Naval Fuel Storage Facility, Jacksonville, Fla.: Acquisition and expansion of residual terminal facility, including tankage, pipe lines and accessory construction; \$3,175,000.

Naval Air Development Station, Johnsville, Pa.: Extension of runways for jet operations, acquisition of aviation easements in runway approach zone, development and test facilities; \$5,253,500.

Naval Station, Key West, Fla.: Dredging at submarine basin; \$739,000.

Naval Aeronautical Rocket Laboratory, Lake Denmark, N. J.: Rocket test and development facilities; \$7,500,000.

Marine Barracks, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Family quarters and utilities; \$5,808,000.

Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Family quarters and utilities (conversion); \$128,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Miramar, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance hangar, parking utilities, services and gasoline storage; \$2,230,000.

Submarine Base, New London, Conn.: Additional torpedo storage; \$135,000.

Naval Base, Newport, R. I.: Acquisition of land on Conanicut Island for small-boat landings; \$9,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.: Test cells for turbine engines; \$485,000.

Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Va.: Combined anti-submarine warfare plot and administration building; \$650,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Va.: Communication facilities for Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet; \$11,650,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.: Family quarters and utilities; \$775,500.

Naval Electronics Laboratory, Point Loma, Calif.: Laboratory supply and utility buildings, including services and accessories; \$3,450,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Completion of two engine test cells; \$300,000.

Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif.: Turbo prop engine test cells; \$530,000.

Special Devices Center, Sands Point, Long Island, N. Y.: Acquisition of land and buildings; \$350,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Conversion of building No. 301 for radiological laboratory; \$1,000,000.

Naval Communications Station, Skaggs, Island, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; \$495,000.

Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Solomons, Md.: Laboratory building and associated facilities; \$2,000,000.

Thirteenth Naval District: Radio direction-finder facilities for supplementary communication requirements; \$211,000.

Twelfth Naval District: Vacuum-system housing at Naval Ordnance Activity; \$85,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Acquisition of rocket target range (314.62 acres); \$35,600.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Model test tank, ballistics laboratory; \$1,540,000.

Navy Communication Station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Addition to radio operating building, permanent remote control high-frequency direction finder facilities, family quarters and utilities; \$509,000.

Location to be determined: Advanced undersea warfare school, \$275,000. Naval experimental range (vertical firing range for VT fuses and range for aircraft damage trials); \$850,000.

Various locations: Additional aviation fuel storage to support jet operations, \$5,000,000. Extension of runways for jet operations at Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Charleston, R. I.; Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.; Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.; Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.; Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Oceana, Va.; and/or at such stations as changes in strategic dispositions indicate; \$11,320,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Adak, Alaska: Permanent communication facilities, including buildings, collateral equipment, and accessory construction, magazine buildings and accessory construction, permanent facilities including buildings, collateral equipment, and accessory construction of communication supplemental activity, family quarters and utilities; \$22,616,000.

Naval Operating Base, Kodiak, Alaska: Extension of runway, family quarters, and utilities; \$2,548,000.

Submarine Base, Balboa, C. Z.: Family quarters; \$1,498,000.

Fourteenth Naval District: Communication control links, including equipment and land; \$527,000.

Naval Operating Base, Grondal, Greenland: Marine railway, machine shop and accessories; \$90,000.

Navy communication supplementary activity, Guam: Permanent facilities for communication supplementary activities, interim operating building and accessory construction; \$8,870,000.

Naval Supply Center, Guam: Additional petroleum storage facilities; \$14,200,000.

Agana Naval Air Station, Guam: Water, electric and sanitary systems; \$1,850,000.

Naval Operating Base, Guam: Extension of power generation, transmission and distribution system, water supply and distribution system, family housing, and completion of civil-service bachelor quarters; \$21,936,000.

Oahu, Hawaii: Acquisition of part of Oahu railroad; \$1.

Naval Operating Base, Kwajalein: Water supply and distribution, power plant, and water distillation, refrigerated storage, sewage disposal system, barracks, mess and gallery; \$5,958,000.

Argentia, Newfoundland: Permanent communication facility, family quarters and utilities (conversion); \$3,193,000.

Pacific: Naval government facilities in Trust Territories; \$1,000,000.

Roosevelt Roads, P. R.: acquisition of land (4,170 acres); \$330,000.

Naval station, Tutuila Island, Samoa: Acquisition of land (11 acres); \$3,500.

Various: Additional communications facilities, \$1,000,000. Aviation gas storage (200,000 bbls.); \$3,600,000.

TITLE III

The Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Bakersfield, Calif.: Purchase and rehabilitation of Mohawk Oil Co. plant, including land; \$141,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,551,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Additional aviation fuel storage and airfield pavements, family quarters and utilities; \$4,717,000.

Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.: Control tower and security fence, family quarters and utilities; \$496,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Airfield pavements, land for runway extension, and aviation fuel storage facilities, family quarters and utilities; \$6,171,000.

Chatham Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Aviation fuel storage facilities, airfield pavements; \$1,275,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz.: Family quarters and utilities; \$2,244,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,584,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex.: Celestial navigation training buildings; \$57,000.

Fairfield-Suisun Air Force Base, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,584,000.

Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Aviation fuel storage facility and airfield pavements, family quarters and utilities; \$7,051,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Shelter and laboratories for automatic radio grid direction finder, alterations of buildings for Watson laboratories, development of instrument landing system, NAVA globe system building; \$3,114,500.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Airfield pavements, aviation fuel storage facilities, family quarters and utilities; \$2,192,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Instrumentation building, telephone circuits to instrumentation sites, utilities, conversion of electrical distribution system, water supply and storage facilities, missile assembly buildings, photo laboratory, commissary, sales store and warehouse, tracking device, telemetering and radar, access trails in range area, technical building, family quarters and utilities, upper atmosphere research station; \$7,679,725.

Hood Air Force Base, Temple, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities, operation building, control tower and fire crash station, night lighting, transformer building, fuel storage, oil storage, electrical distribution system, gas mains, water mains, sewage-disposal facilities, grading and seeding, roads and parking areas, gatehouse, obstruction lighting, airfield pavement; \$2,309,467.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Family quarters and utilities; \$792,000.

Lawson Air Force Base, Columbus, Ga.: Airfield pavement reconstruction; \$500,000.

Limestone Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Family quarters and utilities, barracks, aviation fuel storage facilities, heating plant and extension to existing heating facilities, warehouses, maintenance shops, fire and crash station, bomb handling and storage facilities, airfield pavements, oil storage facilities, commissary, nose hangars, training school building, utilities, roads and parking areas, administrative telephone system, communications and electronic facilities; \$25,134,200.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Aviation fuel storage facilities and airfield pavements, family quarters and utilities; \$4,412,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Trenton, N. J.: Aviation fuel storage facilities; \$700,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; \$528,000.

Moses Lake Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Barracks, family quarters and utilities; \$5,230,000.

Mount Washington Weather Station, N. H.: Climatic projects laboratory; \$363,600.

Muroc Air Force Base, Calif.: Quarter-master warehouse, experimental parachute facilities, electrical system, land for base expansion, unconventional fuel storage, water system, armament engineering test facilities, radar and telemetering station, hangars, pavements, runway and taxiway, warehouse

and railroad spur, hangar shop and warehouse, rocket static test facilities, barracks, family quarters and utilities; \$30,832,580.

Norwalk, Calif.: Rehabilitation and provision of additional operating facilities, purchase of Wilshire and Sunset Oil Co. plants; \$767,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Reconstruction of barracks for troop housing; \$300,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Aviation fuel storage facilities and hangar; \$1,150,000.

Panama City, Fla.: Purchase and rehabilitation of Panama City Oil Co. plant; \$537,339. Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Family quarters and utilities; \$2,376,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Land acquisition, family quarters and utilities; \$1,167,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Aviation fuel storage facilities and airfield pavements; \$600,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Family quarters and utilities; \$2,244,000.

Spokane Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Purchase of land, airfield pavements, aviation fuel storage facilities, barracks; \$6,645,000.

Tacoma, Wash.: Purchase and rehabilitation of General Petroleum Terminal No. 2 facilities; \$200,000.

Topeka Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,452,000.

Torrence, Calif.: Ram jet test facilities; \$250,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Aviation fuel storage facilities, airfield pavements, family quarters and utilities; \$6,672,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,584,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Family quarters and utilities; \$1,584,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Structure branch storage, addition to electrical distribution system for engineering laboratory building, modification to shop and office (Wind Tunnel Building 24C), addition to film storage building, compass test building, modification of wind tunnel (Building 24B), addition to radar test building, high-powered electric whirlrig, extension to electric system, coal handling facilities (Area C), extension to engineer shops, vibration test building; \$3,340,010.

Location to be determined: Additional strategic bulk petroleum storage facilities; \$14,200,000.

Various locations:

Conversion of engine overhaul and test facilities..... \$ 7,990,000

Airways navigational aids and communication facilities..... 10,823,080

Repair and replacement of airfield lighting..... 1,000,000

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaska: Warmup shelters for aircraft, \$1,000,000.

Elelson Air Force Base, Alaska: Theater, maintenance docks, utilities, utilidor and tie-in to new power plant, refrigeration building, power and steam plant, telephone exchange, truck fill stands, barracks, bachelor officers quarters, family quarters and utilities; \$28,156,200.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, Alaska: Telephone system, outside utilities, warm storage for vehicles; \$3,664,600.

Ladd Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; \$5,610,000.

Kindley Air Force Base, Bermuda: Completion of bridge; \$600,000.

Johnston Island Air Force Base: Petroleum storage facilities, salt water flushing system, fresh water supply system, airfield lighting, dock repair and replacement, electrical distribution system, electric power plant, communications facilities; \$2,031,000.

Naha Air Force Base, Okinawa: Sewage facilities; \$1,361,250.

Kadena Air Force Base, Kadena, Okinawa: Sewage system; \$2,825,000.

Dhahran Air Transport Station, Saudi Arabia: Additional facilities; \$4,500,000.

Various locations:

Weather broadcast and point to point communications facilities..... \$1,181,661

Northeast Loran Chain..... 2,850,000

Ground control approach facilities..... 722,934

Air-ground radio stations..... 2,595,737

Three multichannel single side band stations..... 3,741,183

Radar set facilities..... 436,415

Demountable or low-cost family housing..... 8,000,000

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. To accomplish the above-authorized construction, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, are authorized to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended. When necessary, the Secretary of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to commence construction authorized in title I hereof for the special weapons project prior to approval of title to such lands by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but not to exceed:

- (1) For public works authorized by title I:

Inside continental United States.....	\$69,889,700
Outside continental United States.....	81,177,700
Special weapons project.....	14,529,000
- (2) For public works authorized by title II:

Inside continental United States.....	\$98,493,300
Outside continental United States.....	89,219,501
- (3) For public works authorized by title III:

Inside continental United States.....	\$175,540,501
Outside continental United States.....	69,275,980

(4) For such emergency construction projects within and without the continental United States as may be authorized, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, by the Secretary of the Army, \$9,000,000; by the Secretary of the Navy, \$6,000,000; and by the Secretary of the Air Force, \$10,000,000.

SEC. 403. The approximate cost of each project enumerated and authorized by titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward 10 percent, but the total cost of work for each title as authorized in section 402 shall not be exceeded.

SEC. 404. No family quarters shall be constructed under the authority of this act which are in excess of a net floor area of 1,080 square feet per unit.

SEC. 405. No family quarters shall be constructed under the authority of this act at (1) a cost per family unit in excess of \$14,000 for construction, including kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$2,500 for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies: Pro-

vided, That when such units are constructed outside the continental United States, or in Alaska, the limitations on unit costs as specified in this section shall be applicable to the average costs of all units so constructed, and said average unit costs may each be increased by not more than 100 percent.

SEC. 406. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead planning and surveys, and shall be available until expended when specifically provided in the appropriation act.

SEC. 407. Any projects authorized herein may be prosecuted under direct appropriations, or authority to enter into contracts in lieu of such appropriations.

UNIFORMED SERVICES PAY BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the request of the National Military Establishment, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill covering various aspects of military pay and retirement. For some months exhaustive studies have been made on this subject by various groups and the bill as introduced represents the results of those studies. For some 40 years there has been no careful or systematic study made of our military-pay structure and it appears that there is a vital need for consideration of this problem at this time.

I do not propose to discuss the matter in detail at this time because the Armed Services Committee plans to study the matter carefully before making recommendations to the Senate. I would like to state, however, that in the opinion of responsible people in the Military Establishment, the President and myself, this problem of pay and personnel is one of the most pressing matters facing us today. Our military machine can be no better than the personnel who man it. The record shows clearly that we have been losing large numbers of competent personnel whom we may vitally need in the event of war. Such legislation will aid us in attracting and retaining the high-caliber personnel which we need in these days of highly technical military science and activities.

The bill (S. 1876) to provide pay, allowances, retirement, and survivor benefits for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AID TO PERSONS MIGRATING TO REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a letter addressed to me from the Universal African Nationalist Movement, New York City, N. Y., dated May 17, 1949, signed by Benjamin Gibbons, president, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without

objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1880) to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to cooperate with the Republic of Liberia in furthering the interests and welfare of large numbers of persons who are residing in the United States and who desire to emigrate to and settle permanently in the Republic of Liberia. It is the intent of Congress that the benefits and provisions of this act shall apply to citizens of the United States, and aliens who are lawful residents in the United States, who may qualify as eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia, and who by character, physical fitness, and climatic adaptability may qualify as migrants to be permanently settled in the Republic of Liberia, and who shall have voluntarily expressed a desire to become migrants under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized and directed to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Liberia for the purpose of obtaining the consent of that country to the migration and permanent settlement of individuals assisted in accordance with the provisions of this act. The President shall further negotiate with the Government of the Republic of Liberia to secure reasonable guarantees that safety of life and limb and freedom of action for the migrants while under Liberian rule will be assured; that the Government of the Republic of Liberia will earnestly prohibit and punish any act or acts of intolerance or persecution, either political, social, or economic, of the migrants because of their condition as migrants; and that the migrants while aliens in the Republic of Liberia shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of any other aliens resident in the Republic of Liberia, and that, after naturalization, they shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of other citizens of the Republic of Liberia. The provisions of this section shall be a condition precedent to other provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Liberian Migration Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1954, and one member of the Commission shall be designated by him as chairman. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The Commission may employ necessary personnel, including technicians, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provision for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this act, and in compliance therewith, for the migration of eligible persons to the Republic of Liberia. It shall also be the duty of the Commission to report on February 1, 1950, and semiannually thereafter to the President and to the Congress on the situation regarding the migration of eligible persons to Liberia. At the end of its term the Commission shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 4. (a) Under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, any citizen of the United States, and any alien who is a lawful resident of the United States, who is

in good physical condition and is capable by reason of his training, adaptability, intelligence, and ambition of becoming a self-sustaining settler in the Republic of Liberia, and who desires to become a migrant and settler in such country, may file an application on blanks prepared and supplied by the Commission requesting assistance in migrating to and permanently settling in the Republic of Liberia. Such application shall furnish such information as will enable the Commission to properly assess and evaluate the qualifications of the applicant. If the applicant is a householder, he may make application for all the members of his household as a unit. The application of a person responsible for the support and maintenance of children under the age of 16 years shall not be favorably acted upon unless such children are to accompany such applicant on his migration, or unless he has made adequate provision for their support and maintenance pending their transfer to join the applicant in the Republic of Liberia.

(b) The following persons shall not be eligible for migration under this act: Escaped convicts or fugitives from justice, persons under indictment and awaiting trial, persons who by reason of past criminal offenses are poor risks of becoming law-abiding and self-sustaining settlers in the Republic of Liberia, persons applying for migration for the purpose of defrauding creditors, and such other persons as the Commission may reasonably believe are likely to become public charges or social liabilities in the Republic of Liberia or who are otherwise unacceptable to the Government of the Republic of Liberia. The findings of the Commission with respect to the eligibility of any person for migration under this act shall be final.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to lease, furnish, and equip such office space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as it may deem necessary; order goods and services from private individuals or concerns in the ordinary course of trade; requisition any department, board or agency of the United States for any available goods, services, or facilities which may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act, without affecting the proper operation of such department, board, or agency; provide transportation by land and by sea to qualified applicants migrating under the provisions of this act, and to their households, from the initial point of departure in the United States to the point of settlement in the Republic of Liberia, and to contract with land and maritime transportation companies for such purposes to the extent necessary by reason of the fact that such transportation facilities are not available from the Government of the United States; and provide adequate subsistence, medical care, and other necessities of life for the migrants during transit and until finally settled at the point of settlement.

(b) With the consent of the Government of the Republic of Liberia, the Commission is authorized to select or approve suitable sites for settlement of migrants in the Republic of Liberia; to establish and operate reception and disembarkation centers, supply depots, commissaries, temporary housing at points of settlement, dispensaries, pharmacies, and first-aid stations, and such other buildings and facilities as are necessary and proper to safeguard the health of the migrants and to carry out the purposes of this act, together with all necessary equipment and personnel.

(c) The Commission is further authorized, within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to it to supply tools, equipment, materials, and technical assistance and advice, to the migrants when necessary to assist them in becoming self-sustaining members of their communities; to make loans to individuals, partnerships, or corporations

composed of migrants, in meritorious cases, not to exceed \$1,000 in any case, on reasonably liberal terms and conditions, as initial capital for business and industrial enterprises in Liberia; and to cooperate with and render technical and other assistance to the Government of the Republic of Liberia, or its responsible agencies, in the establishment of towns and rural districts, improvement of conditions of public sanitation, construction of public works and facilities, reclamation of land, development and improvement of utilities, schools, hospitals, and transportation facilities, encouragement of business enterprise and capital investments in the Republic of Liberia, and the construction, development, or encouragement of such other public works or projects as will tend to raise the standard of living and increase the productivity of the Republic of Liberia.

SEC. 6. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 7. The authority conferred by this act shall expire on June 30, 1954. This act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment.

The letter presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

UNIVERSAL AFRICAN NATIONALIST
MOVEMENT, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 17, 1949.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Receipt of your letter of May 12, 1949, with enclosure of proposed bill is hereby acknowledged with much thanks and appreciation.

We have gone over the contents thereof and have given it much consideration, and wish to state that it meets our hearty approval.

If there is anything within our power that will help to further its passage, we would be only too glad to contribute thereto, and we do sincerely hope that you will be able to obtain the necessary support to enable its successful enactment.

May we express to Mr. Reynolds and all those who helped to frame this bill our greatest appreciation, for through your kind direction, it is all that one can expect it to be; may God ever bless you with longevity of life that you may continue to do much good for humanity.

While hoping to hear from you in the very near future, with the very best of wishes, I have the honor to be,

Most respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN GIBBONS,
President.

CONSERVATION OF ORES, METALS, AND MINERALS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. McFARLAND) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 240) to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CLASS IV AND LARGER AIRPORT PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 77)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on May 2 there was laid before the

Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce transmitting a request of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for authority to undertake certain projects for the development of class IV and larger airports during the fiscal year 1950.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce together with the accompanying papers be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 195. An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 623. An act for the relief of Sadako Takagi;

H. R. 656. An act for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 703. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Otevin Foxworth;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of the Central Bank, a California corporation, as assignee of John C. Williams, an individual operating under the fictitious name and trade style of Central Machine Works, of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Hoy C. Wong;

H. R. 1173. An act for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters;

H. R. 1297. An act for the relief of Alvin G. Patton;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard;

H. R. 1619. An act for the relief of St. Elizabeth Hospital, Yakima, Wash., and others;

H. R. 1620. An act for the relief of Robert E. Bridge and Leslie E. Ensign;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Bates;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Col. Wlodzimierz Onacewicz;

H. R. 2850. An act for the relief of Denise Simeon Boutant;

H. R. 3127. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of Jacob Gross, a minor;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 3320. An act for the relief of Ignacio Colon Cruz;

H. R. 3321. An act for the relief of Gloria Esther Diaz, Lydia Velez, and Gladys Prieto;

H. R. 3471. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sarah J. Miller;

H. R. 3720. An act for the relief of Erwin F. Earl;

H. R. 4106. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 4186. An act for the relief of Jan Liga;

H. R. 4307. An act for the relief of Ever Ready Supply Co. and Harold A. Dahlborg;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; and

H. R. 4559. An act for the relief of Louis Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1790. An act to restore certain land in Alaska to the public domain and to au-

thorize its sale to Ford J. Dale, of Fairbanks, Alaska;

H. R. 2588. An act to confirm title in V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard to certain lands in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.;

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird; and

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROCEEDINGS ON THE OCCASION OF DEDICATION OF PLAQUE TO JOHN TYLER AT RICHMOND, VA.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings on the occasion of the dedication of a plaque to John Tyler, tenth President of the United States, on the capitol grounds in Richmond, Va., on April 12, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD ON OCCASION OF DEDICATION OF PLAQUE TO JOHN TYLER AT RICHMOND, VA.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him on the occasion of the dedication of a plaque to John Tyler, the tenth President of the United States, on the capitol grounds in Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

MODERATION FOR REPUBLICANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Moderation for Republicans, delivered by her at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican Committee, in Washington, D. C., on February 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER OF THE PRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Power of the Press, delivered by her at the annual dinner of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association in New York on Thursday, April 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY BEFORE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CITIZENSHIP

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him before the National Conference on Citizenship, at New York City, on May 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARSHALL PLAN AID AND SOCIALIZATION—ARTICLE BY FRANK GERVASI

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "ERP Hasn't Financed Socialization," written by Frank Gervasi and published in the Washington Post of May 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RALPH E. BECKER BEFORE THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS AT PORTSMOUTH, N. H.

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Ralph E. Becker, chairman of Young Republican National Federation, before the New England Council of Young Republicans at Portsmouth, N. H., on May 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFLICTING JURISDICTION IN FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL EVERY EVENING

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Backing For Boggs' Bill," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, on Tuesday, May 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TINY PITCHER MOLDED BY TEXAS POTTER—ARTICLE FROM MARSHALL (TEX.) NEWS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tiny Pitcher Molded by Texas Potter," published in the Marshall (Tex.) News of May 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOANS TO GERMANY AND DILLON, READ & CO.—ARTICLE FROM THE MAGAZINE PREVENT WORLD WAR III

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Loans to Germany and Dillon, Read & Co.," published in the magazine Prevent World War III, issue of March-April 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR LEE, OF UTAH—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA DAILY JOURNAL STOCK-MAN

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Answer to Taxpayer's Prayer?" published in the Omaha Daily Journal Stockman of April 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT—EDITORIAL FROM WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Loaded Automatic," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE — EDITORIAL FROM PRICE (UTAH) SUN-ADVOCATE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Socialized Medicine," published in the Price (Utah) Sun-Advocate of May 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROTHERHOOD OF MAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Brotherhood Day dinner of the Philadelphia Chapter, National Conference of Christians and Jews, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, May 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT—STATEMENT BY REV. EDGAR M. WAHLBERG

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations by Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, of Denver, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

INVITATION TO ROOSEVELT PARK DEDICATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 3 minutes, in order to extend an invitation to the Members of the Senate to attend the dedication of Roosevelt Park, at Medora, N. Dak., on June 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Roosevelt National Memorial Park, established in honor of Teddy Roosevelt, as authorized by Public Law 38 of the Eightieth Congress, will be dedicated at Medora, N. Dak., on June 4, and, on behalf of the citizens of my State, I am

extending an invitation to my colleagues to attend this auspicious occasion and to visit the park on the day of its introduction to the entire Nation.

This national park has been established in the Badlands in western North Dakota in memory of Theodore Roosevelt.

I quote from House Report No. 49 on House bill 731:

It was to this area that 25-year-old Theodore Roosevelt came in 1892 for a hunting trip, to drown his sorrow and recover his health after serving an arduous term in the New York Legislature and saddened by the loss of his mother and wife. He became so attached to this scenic area and its possibilities for stock raising that he decided to remain. He purchased the Chimney Butte, or Maltese Cross, ranch south of Medora for \$45,000 and later established the Elkhorn ranch 40 miles north of the Maltese Cross ranch and north of the village.

At the latter ranch and in Medora several of his books on hunting trips were written. He was deputy sheriff of Billings County and took an active part in civic affairs in this area. He invested about \$125,000 in his ranching enterprises in the vicinity. * * *

The Badlands of North Dakota have a distinct value from a recreational, scenic, and historical viewpoint. The nature of the terrain of this area is not mountainous; it is an area where the wind and water have eroded the soft earth away, causing that portion of the land and rock formations that were slightly harder to stand out, forming canyons, peaks, spires, eroded hills, and mesas.

This is truly rugged, scenic territory, where the imagination may perceive most any shape or semblance. There is a great deal of agate and petrified wood in this area. The people of North Dakota have been advocating a national park in the Badlands for many years and it is now being dedicated on June 4 to the memory of one of our most prominent citizens and former Presidents.

It is believed that this park will preserve for posterity an area of great interest and benefit to the citizens of the entire Nation. This area is about midway between the heavily populated sections in the Great Lakes region and the Yellowstone and other national parks. Its scenery is different from that of any other national park.

In my opinion it is more beautiful than the Grand Canyon.

Many tourists have pronounced it as more interesting and alluring than any other national park they have visited.

I can assure the Members of the Senate that they will experience genuine North Dakota hospitality if they can attend the ceremonies on this occasion.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE IN HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received from a distinguished citizen of Honolulu under date of May 12; that following the letter there be published in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Schmidt's Loose Tongue," published in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 11, 1949; and that following the editorial there be published in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of May 13, 1949, by a prominent citizen of Honolulu. The letters and editorial will give the Senate some information with reference to the situation which exists in Hawaii at this time. I have omitted the names of those who sent me the letters, but I can assure Senators that they were written by very responsible individuals.

There being no objection, the letters and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, May 12, 1949.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Enclosed is an editorial clipped from yesterday morning's Advertiser.

This man Schmidt is one of the leading Communists on the coast, a right-hand man of Harry Bridges. He, in his remarks, made it clear that it is the intention of the Communists on the coast to take their spite out on the Territory.

Mr. FARRINGTON has said that there are no more Communists in proportion in Hawaii than there are on the mainland. That is not the point at all. In no State has one Communist leader the power to starve the people of that State. Harry Bridges has, and has demonstrated that power many times.

It is my sincere belief that if an election in Hawaii did not go to suit him that he would call a strike simply to punish the people here. He has called them for much less in the past.

The Honolulu Record (a Communist paper which is run by a Japanese Communist inspired through Dr. John Reinecke) is continuously trying to create race hatred and has succeeded very well in the past. They have gone back to the days of the monarchy in an attempt to prove racial discrimination.

Plainly speaking, the coast Communists have us by the throat, and the disastrous strike now in progress here is simply to prove the power that the Communist leaders have over their followers here.

So long as we are under the control of the United States Congress, there is some hope of relief for our troubles. If we were a State, there could be no interference.

Sincerely,

[From the Honolulu Advertiser of May 11, 1949]

MR. SCHMIDT'S LOOSE TONGUE

Imported strike leader Henry Schmidt talked with a loose tongue aboard the *Lurline* Monday. He told with brutal frankness how the longshore strike leaders are wearing down the community, expect to reduce it to submission within a few weeks, and how they are making gestures to fool the public. Here are some of the things he said:

"They (Hawaii's people) can't take it much more than a month."

"The *Lurline* (whose crew supposedly is not on strike) was tied up here to boost the morale of the striking longshoremen."

The longshore union's offer to help stranded passengers get hotel accommodations was "merely a gesture to the public (to) take the heat off the union and put it on Matson."

When he called some 300 *Lurline* employees into the ship's dining room to hear him talk, Mr. Schmidt did not recognize two reporters, one from the Advertiser and one from the Star-Bulletin, among them. When both these reporters quoted him accurately, Mr. Schmidt did not like it. He called the reporters liars, tried to crawl out of what he had said. But that was of no avail. Both are men whose credibility has long been established. Both men heard the same things, both of them printed the truth.

Now the public knows just how Mr. Schmidt and his fellow strike leaders are directing this strike straight at the people of all Hawaii. It is information that came directly from Mr. Schmidt himself.

HONOLULU, HAWAII, May 13, 1949.

Senator HUGH BUTLER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I am enclosing the front and back page of this morning's Advertiser.

You will note that our people are becoming quite disturbed by their letters to the paper. It is said there are only a few hundred Communists here. Thank God there are no more.

One Communist on the mainland, Harry Bridges, has it in for our people here and is doing us tremendous harm. There is no doubt but that his stooges here control from thirty to forty thousand votes.

The threat has already been made that at the next election we will show them something. They are already showing us what they can do. Were we a State, they would be in control.

Leading citizens here admit that this is true. Fear keeps them from talking.

Sincerely,

ISSUANCE OF VISAS TO PERSONS OF GERMAN ETHNIC ORIGIN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared on the subject of expelled persons of German ethnic origin and their admission to our country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY ON ISSUANCE OF VISAS TO PERSONS OF GERMAN ETHNIC ORIGIN

On previous occasions I have called the attention of the Senate to the critical situation involving the lagging in the issuance of visas to persons of German ethnic origin, that is, to the so-called expellees under the displaced-persons law. Although the DP law is almost a full year old right now, only a tiny trickle of expellees have come in thus far. Some 400 quota numbers were allocated for issuance to persons of German ethnic origin in April. Consular offices have thus far reported issuance of 104 of these numbers.

Five hundred quota numbers have been allocated for May issuance and 400 allocated for June issuance. Consulates have been informed that additional numbers are immediately available upon request. If 500 represents a peak achievement almost a full year after the passage of the law, it can easily be seen that the progress under the expellee portion of this law is hopelessly slow, even in relation to the tardiness in handling the over-all DP law.

Under the DP law, half of the regular Austrian and German quotas are made available to expellees, amounting in summary to around 13,000 annually in the case of the German quota and a little over 700 in the case of the Austrian quota. Obviously, these numbers will hardly be filled by expellees on the basis of the present lagging condition.

I can well understand some of the administrative complications involved in trying to set up machinery for admission of the expellees. The very problem of the definition of persons of German ethnic origin, the time necessary for screening, the problem of adequate personnel—these and other questions I do not for one moment underestimate. At the same time, it is obvious that this is a tremendous matter of heartache and heart-break to the families involved, and every passing day causes that much more woe and, yes, financial and personal anxiety.

In making these comments I do not for one moment underestimate the importance of speed in connection with the regular categories of displaced persons. Throughout the discussion on this subject I have pointed out that the problem is not a matter of securing justice for displaced persons or expelled persons, but rather securing justice for both of these groups to the greatest extent possible.

in accordance with our humanitarian obligations to all suffering people regardless of the cause of their suffering.

Along a somewhat related line, I have contacted the Post Office Department and urged that immediate action be taken for resumption of the private gift-package service to the Soviet zone in Berlin and the Soviet zone in Germany, now that the Berlin blockade has been ended. During the blockade, of course, normal shipment of these private gift packages ceased both to our zones in Germany and Berlin as well as to the Soviet areas. Now, however, I am hoping that the Post Office Department will take immediate steps to contact the Soviet officials in order to have this humanitarian service resumed. Not only is it a matter of essential food supplies being sent in, but also vital medical equipment and other items which are essential for the sustaining of life and health.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 326) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, which was, in lines 10 and 11, to strike out "January 15" and insert "March 31."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is merely a minor amendment which changes the date of the effectiveness of the bill, and does not change the jurisdiction or the subject matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF OFFICE OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1152) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, which was, on page 2, line 12, to strike out "James" and insert "Janet."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say by way of explanation that the amendment merely corrects what may have been a clerical error by changing the name from "James" to "Janet." I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SPREADING THREAT OF COMMUNISM IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, no one can possibly watch the spreading threat of communism in the Far East gather momentum without a feeling of disgust and alarm.

No real American can anticipate a Communist conquest of China without terrible misgiving. There are some in our midst who are overjoyed at the prospect of a Communist victory in China. This is what they have been working for for years, right in our own midst.

There is another group that is preparing the American people to accept a wholly new propaganda line concerning the issues that are at stake in the Far East.

This new line first broke into print in respectable circles in a New York Times article of January 28, 1949, carrying the sentiments expressed by Prof. Edward C. Acheson, the brother of our Secretary of State, who is quoted as saying:

In a few weeks we will have to write off China as a 100-percent loss. * * *

If the Russians get into China they will have the same miserable experience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's.

Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. * * *

I do not think that the Chinese Communists are Moscow Communists.

Even if they were, they will still have their hands full administering the vast territories they have overrun.

A few weeks later, Mr. President, echoing these administration thoughts, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, writing in the New York Times, said:

Quite plainly, the policy makers of the United States are counting upon the historic forces of Chinese nationalism to assert themselves strongly under a Mao Tze-tung government vis-à-vis the U. S. S. R. as they did under a Chiang Kai-shek government vis-à-vis the United States.

In a recent letter to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], no less a person than our own Secretary of State attempted to quiet the rising fears of the American people by echoing this same propaganda line, and at the same time insisted that there was nothing more the United States could do to save the situation.

How closely all of this follows the pro-Communist line is reflected in a recent book, now documented, titled "The Situation in Asia," by Owen Lattimore, in which he insists that although China is certain to go Communist, it will continue to function as an independent state, because it will be impossible for Russia to step in and control the Chinese Communist leaders.

Yet, Mr. President, the ink was not dry on the proof copy of this manuscript when, on April 3, a United Press dispatch from Nanking quoted a Communist broadcast of a statement signed by No. 1 Communist Mao Tze-tung and other Chinese Communist leaders denouncing the North Atlantic Pact and pledging to fight on the side of Russia in the event of any war between the Soviet Union and the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

However, Mr. President, a great number of Americans are becoming increasingly alarmed over the real implications of these ominous developments in China.

On May 4, 1949, William Henry Chamberlin recognized the seriousness of this situation when he wrote:

The news from China represents one of the greatest diplomatic fiascos in American history.

The open door to that vast country, one of the pillars of traditional American foreign policy, is slamming shut very hard.

The most numerous people in the world are rapidly passing under the sway of a regime that is linked up by very close ties with Moscow, that makes no secret of its violent hostility to this country. * * *

What has happened in China is tragic, from the standpoint both of the Chinese people and of United States foreign policy.

Even Walter Lippmann himself admits that matters have so deteriorated that—

There can be no such thing as an American policy which "unsolves" the Chinese problem.

Our policy, when we are again in a position to have one, will necessarily be limited to making such contacts as we can on the best terms that can be arranged with the Chinese authorities on or near the coast of China.

Whether they will also have authority in the deep interior, no man can say.

It is quite conceivable that there will not be for decades, perhaps for generations, any Chinese government which, except in name, is obeyed by all the Chinese.

And Mr. Chamberlin and Mr. Lippmann are in essential agreement when we find Mr. Chamberlin also saying:

For the immediate future, we have little choice except to go isolationist as regards China.

We might have been in a better position today if we had set our course in that direction 10 or 15 years ago.

The sorry truth is, however, Mr. President, that we now confront this tragic Communist conquest in China in face of the fact that we did not remain isolationist, that we did enter the most tragic war in history, throwing the tremendous resources of the American people into a struggle to preserve the independence and integrity of China.

This is why the economic, the political, and the military defeat that is now being inflicted upon the American people, after we won the war in the Pacific, carries such staggering implications.

The full measure of our defeat in China can be measured by the fact that there would have been no Pearl Harbor, no savage Bataan, no tragic and terrible victories on Okinawa, Iwo Jima, and no sweating, suffering, and dying by the American GI's in the plague-ridden jungles of the Orient, if it had not been for the determination of an American President to support the independence and the integrity of China against the savage aggression of Japan.

In his autobiography, *On Active Service*, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War in the Roosevelt Cabinet, admits:

A careful reading of the diplomatic negotiations that preceded Pearl Harbor can lead to no conclusion but that it was American support of China—American refusal to repudiate the principles of Hay, Hughes, Stimson and Hull—which proved the final cause of the break-down of negotiations and the beginning of war.

If at any time the United States had been willing to concede to Japan a free hand in China, there would have been no war in the Pacific.

The reason, Mr. President, why such an increasing number of Americans are becoming so alarmed is that such a staggering defeat is being inflicted on the United States while the United States Government stands idly by, refusing further aid

to our traditional friends and refusing to account for the disaster.

The surest way in the world to add chaos to tragedy is to fail to profit by the errors and the bloodiness and betrayals that produce the tragedy.

The leading editorial of the Wall Street Journal of May 4, 1949, points up the tragic dilemma in which we now find ourselves:

In 1940 this country was given the story that Chiang Kai-shek was a great military strategist, a great patriot, and a great idealist.

Today the version is that Chiang is a military moron, and is under the suspicion of being an absconder, or at least a man of wholly selfish motives.

And it is sad to say that our foreign policy is still supported by efforts to keep the American people from considering more than one view.

It is still being framed in an atmosphere of slanted information and withheld facts.

Mr. President, the American people are going to hold a day of reckoning. They expect their representatives in the United States Senate to do everything in their power to drag out into the open for all to see the facts that lie behind the collapse of China, together with all the implications, and to demand that America's interests, based on a restoration of basic American principles, be safeguarded within the framework of a genuine over-all foreign policy, the heart of which gives the American people control once more over their own destiny.

What lies behind the collapse of our policies in China? First, we now know that, in spite of all the terrible sacrifice and suffering, borne largely by American GI's, the conduct of the war and of American diplomacy during and since the war could not have been better designed to defeat our own vital interests and to play directly into the hands of the Communists in the Far East.

There can be no question that American policies in China have succeeded thus far only in destroying the one oriental nation that was strong enough to prevent Communist expansion in Asia, and in turning loose the Communist tyranny which the Japanese alone were able to hold in check.

Is it any wonder that the American people are now demanding an investigation of the personnel and policies of the State Department which laid the groundwork for such a tragic defeat?

In the second place the American people are just beginning to realize what a criminal betrayal of China took place at the Yalta Conference, where the following secret agreement concerning China took place without the knowledge, advice, or consent of any authorized Chinese Government representative. That part of the secret agreements made at Yalta pertaining to China and Japan is in full as follows:

1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved;

2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz:

(A) The southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it, shall be returned to the Soviet Union.

(B) The commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored.

(C) The Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad, which provide an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded, and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria.

3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. President, note that Chiang Kai-shek was not there; no representative was there. But they pulled the rug out from under him and then tacked on that statement at the end.

I read further:

The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

Mr. President, to this moment the Yalta agreement, along with Tehran, Potsdam, and other secret agreements, form the basis of our international relations, although they have no standing whatever as treaties. They have never been submitted to the Senate for acceptance, amendment, or repudiation. They certainly cannot be classified as executive agreements. They are neither bird, beast, nor fish, and the American people are now demanding that their representatives in the United States Senate refuse longer to be bound by these outrageous betrayals of American principles in the future handling of our international relations.

For all we know now, until the status of these agreements has been decided with the knowledge, advice, and consent of the United States Senate, American Government representatives can continue to sell America down the river with their left hand, while they continue to wave the flag of international cooperation above our heads with their right hand.

This is just such a condition as existed during and since the war, as is described by Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on November 27, 1945—8 months after the Yalta sell-out:

The astounding feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations.

The professional Foreign Service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself.

I requested the relief of career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war.

These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and far eastern divisions of the State Department as my supervisors.

In such positions, most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and, at times, with the imperialist bloc of nations.

Mr. President, until the status of these outrageous secret agreements is cleared

up, and we can start anew with a clean and clear record, we cannot possibly prevent a repetition of double talking and double dealing by those representing us in international affairs, who either want to sell us down the river, or who want to continue to cover up the part they have played in the outrageous betrayal of American principles that has led to a catastrophe in China.

Of this much we can be sure, Mr. President: As matters now stand, the Chinese Communist conquest of Asia was not made possible in China. It was engineered right here in Washington, by the top policy makers of this Government, who are now sorrowfully wringing their hands behind their backs and mouthing futile formulas of nonintervention as the only course of action left to us.

The third implication, Mr. President, of the tragedy that is in the making in the Far East is that, with China's loss, we face a complete defeat in the Orient.

In the spring of 1948, Gen. George Marshall told Congress that if Manchuria were lost to the Chinese Communists, the United States position in southern Korea would be untenable.

In the fall of 1948, Gen. Douglas MacArthur warned the Joint Chiefs of Staff that if the Chinese Communists took the lower Yangtze Valley and Shanghai, the American military bastion on Okinawa would be outflanked and his position in Japan would be as exposed and untenable as it was in the Philippines during 1941.

When we realize that General Bradley just recently told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that our system of military defenses in the Pacific was based on Japan, the Philippines, and Okinawa, we get a better understanding of the threat to our own military security which the continued Communist advance in China carries.

Then, Mr. President, in his recent book, *Way of a Fighter*, Gen. Claire Chennault warned:

A complete Communist victory in China will channelize the undercurrents of native unrest already swirling through Burma, India, Malaya, and Indonesia into another rising tide of Communist victories.

The ring of red bases can be stretched from Siberia to Saigon.

Then the stage will be set for the unannounced explosion of world war III.

It is perfectly obvious, Mr. President, where this steady spread of Communist aggression will end.

The avowed aim of the Chinese Communists and of the Communist movements throughout the Asiatic Continent is to drive the white man and every last vestige of western imperialism out of Asia.

This means French Indochina, Indonesia, the Malayan States, and even India will be swallowed up.

The fourth implication, Mr. President, of what lies ahead is what the loss of both the raw material resources of the colonial areas will mean, both to the western imperial powers we are supplying with Marshall plan aid, as well as to ourselves.

If these raw material resources are lost to the nations embraced within the

Atlantic Pact, the additional burden placed upon the United States to try to stretch its own resources to share with the western European nations that will be deprived of these materials will automatically put the American economy into the strait-jacket of a ration system that will make the OPA seem like a utopia.

In addition, the loss of these areas to Communist domination will make a mockery of the President's plan to raise the standard of living of the underdeveloped areas of the world as potential markets for the increased industrial potential which we are subsidizing under the Marshall plan in western Europe.

A fifth implication, Mr. President, of this expanding Communist threat in the Orient lies in the fact that since we have already committed ourselves under the Marshall plan to assisting in the re-imposition of British, French, and Dutch colonial imperialism in Asia, continued guarantees of support of such policies will help to spread the Communist plague even further and more rapidly.

We will put ourselves in a position where we will be continually blackmailed by our own associates, who will use the threat of Communist fifth-column activity in their colonial possessions as a basis for continued demands on our resources to underwrite the perpetuation of conditions that give the Communist propaganda knife its cutting edge.

No one has more clearly seen the nature of this dilemma than has Walter Lippmann, who wrote in the Washington Post of January 12, 1949:

Our friends in western Europe should try to understand why we cannot and must not be maneuvered, why we dare not drift into general opposition to the movements for independence in Asia.

They should tell their propagandists to stop smearing these movements.

They should try to realize how disastrous it would be to them, and to the cause of western civilization, if ever it could be said that the western union for the defense of freedom in Europe was in Asia a syndicate for the preservation of decadent empires.

In the sixth place, a recent Christian Science Monitor article of April 6, 1949, reveals the additional danger to American security by the success of the Communists in China by analyzing a demand by Communist representatives for recognition by the United Nations.

Note, Mr. President—recognition by the United Nations.

This same demand was made during the San Francisco Charter Conference—a demand which was turned down by our insistence that we were backing the Nationalist regime.

But the Security Council, with the veto provisions, was set up on the basis of a continued recognition of the Nationalist regime in China.

Since we ourselves are committed to a policy of noninvolvement in the internal affairs of another nation, we have already taken the position in this international booby trap that we shall be the first ones who are obligated to recognize the Chinese Communist de facto government, which will join the select circle within the Security Council, and add its

veto to that of Russia, where America's vital interests and policies are at stake.

Is not that something?

Mr. President, another implication of this China collapse lies both in the field of economic and military strategy, so far as Russia is concerned.

Russia will take over control of the raw materials and the markets of the Far East, with which she can increase her bargaining power with the western European nations to neutralize Europe at her back while she takes over Asia which lies before her.

Russia will also be able to make up for the greatest single liability she confronts in Europe, namely, her fear to permit Russian soldiers to contact the higher standards of living of western civilization.

She will be able to take ten or twenty-five or fifty million Chinese Communists, train and equip them, and ship them to the eastern frontiers of the European countries, to be turned loose without any fear of domestic upheaval when the time comes in Russian strategy once more to press her advantages in Europe.

Then, incredible as it may seem, Mr. President, we find that we are also obligated to furnish China with the majority of reparations from Japan. It will be remembered that this is the same deal which we have in Italy. We send our Marshall-plan dollars to Italy, under the treaty which we ratified with Italy. Italy, in turn, takes our products and our wealth and sends them on to Russia in reparations. We are committed to the same thing in China, which means that we are obligated to subsidize the Communist regime if and when it takes over in China.

Mr. President, while all these implications are involved in the steady expansion of the Communist threat in China, there is another implication which is far more serious and imminent than this administration dares to admit.

I am speaking of the immediate possibility of involvement in an undeclared war with the Chinese Communists on the Asiatic mainland, because of a conflict between the Chinese Communists and our so-called western allies who have already signed the Atlantic Pact, and through such involvement to be drawn into a conflict with Russia.

I have already mentioned the Communist broadcast of April 3 of a statement by Mao Tze-tung denouncing the western treaty and pledging aid to fight on the side of Russia in the event of a war.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor of May 5, 1949, revealed that the Chinese Communists have joined in a Russian-sanctioned alliance with Korean and Burmese Communists as part of "the joint struggle against American and British imperialism."

Immediately following this announcement, a United Press dispatch of May 7 in the Washington Post revealed that President Rhee, of the Republic of South Korea, had inquired of the United States Government whether it would regard an invasion across the 38th parallel by the Soviet-dominated North Korean Republic as "tantamount to an attack on

the American people." President Rhee specifically asked, "in case of an attack by an outside power, would the Republic of South Korea be able to count on all-out military aid?"

Then we learn, Mr. President, that it has become necessary for the French Government to ship additional reinforcements into Indochina in order to stop the current infiltration of Communist Chinese guerrilla forces.

On April 19, 1949, another dispatch to the Christian Science Monitor revealed that the French are shipping 15,000 additional troops, in north African and Senegalese contingents, to Indochina, bringing French military forces to 125,000—forces which are supplied with matériel acquired from United States surplus military stocks.

On May 5, a United Press dispatch from London revealed that Britain's Defense Minister, A. V. Alexander, was greeted in the House of Commons by a stormy demand for a Pacific pact similar to the Atlantic Pact, within which it would be stated that:

Any attack against Hong Kong would be regarded as an attack of aggression as against Britain.

Do Senators realize the situation into which we are getting ourselves?

Moreover, Mr. President, we learned from this same dispatch that the British were sending additional air, sea, and land reinforcements to the defense of Hong Kong against the threatened Communist attack.

We also learn that these forces will augment existing British military forces in the Far East, which have been reorganized into an entirely new defense set-up in the Far East.

Over the ticker in the Senate anteroom on May 9, 1949, in a Tokyo dispatch via Hong Kong, we were informed that:

Some American officials in Japan are wondering if the United States would be obligated under the Atlantic Pact to help defend Hong Kong if the Chinese Communists attack it.

Reliable British quarters here are sure that the Communists will attack the British crown colony.

One informed British source said it is not a question of if it will be attacked, but of when.

Neutral observers say the Chinese Communists appear to hold no fear of the British.

The Communists have repeatedly demanded the elimination of all foreign influence from China.

It must be obvious to the American people by now, Mr. President, how grave these implications are, particularly when we realize that in the face of this imminent conflict between the Chinese Communists backed by Russia and the western European imperial powers who have become signatories to the Atlantic Pact, this Government is already acting as though the ratification of the pact is a fait accompli.

The uneasiness which such a situation has aroused has been given expression by one of the outstanding members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who announced his whole-

hearted support of a reservation to be attached to the Atlantic Pact in the Senate which would spell out the fact that the United States, by ratification of the pact, is not committed to give aid to pact members who are having colonial troubles.

The Senator is quoted as saying:

I don't see how we can be concerned with a revolutionary attack in the colonies of other signatories.

That point is left in some doubt, and it ought to be cleared up.

On that point, Mr. President, if we give the Dutch arms and equipment and they send them to the east, or if we give them to France and they send the arms and equipment and men to Indochina, or if we give them to Britain, for our own defense and our own security, and they ship them to Hong Kong, I ask, are we not actually involving ourselves in the far eastern struggle?

My own uneasiness and my own vigorous protest against any easy acceptance of a notion that we are committed to underwrite the colonial areas of the signatories of this pact are based on the document prepared by the Secretary of State entitled "The North Atlantic Pact," publication 3462, which reveals on page 5, the following interesting provision:

The treaty will come into force when the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including Belgium, Canada, France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, have been deposited.

For the other signatory states, and for those states which become parties at a later date, the treaty will come into effect on the date of the deposit of their individual ratifications.

Mr. President, it is time the implications of this provision were clearly presented to the American people, for until this is done, we are, for all intents and purposes, actually committing ourselves to underwriting the Brussels military defense pact, which was drafted by the western imperial powers with a view not only to preserving the status quo in Europe, but the status quo in their colonial possessions around the world.

Mr. President, that is the purpose of the Brussels Pact, and as the North Atlantic Treaty now stands, even in its present status, we are becoming inescapably involved in moral commitments, at least, to defend with American resources and manpower not only these western imperial powers, but their colonial possessions, upon the maintenance of which their whole political, economic, and military security is based.

Proof of this charge lies behind an admission by our own Ambassador Jessup, who, on March 17, 1949, in speaking of the Atlantic Pact, said:

It has, as you know, a rather immediate background—

And I ask my colleagues to note this—

It has, as you know, a rather immediate background in terms of the Brussels Pact, the Vandenberg resolution, and the Rio Pact.

So we recognize it, do we not?

Mr. President, in support of this charge, I want to enter into the Record four specific events that are memorable be-

cause of the sequence in which they have taken place within recent weeks.

The first is Mr. Churchill's speech in early April in which he said that only the deterrent of the atomic bomb in the hands of the United States holds Soviet imperialist expansion in check.

I do not know how much we have got it in our hands after reading the morning newspapers about the carryings on of Mr. Lillenthal and others. I do not know whether we still have it in our hands. Anyway Mr. Churchill in April thought we had.

Just a few days later, on April 6, President Truman, referring to his decision in July 1945 to use the atomic bomb, said:

Now, I believe we are in a position where we will never have to make that decision again, but if it has to be made . . . I wouldn't hesitate to make it again.

On the same day Secretary Royall told a Chicago mass meeting that the Atlantic Pact nations are counting on American arms for their own troops and also counting on the support of an American army overseas.

Then, on May 3, former Under Secretary of State Will Clayton, flying in the face of all the optimistic propaganda of how we were winning the cold war with Russia, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that Russia is winning the cold war by frightening democratic governments into excessive expenditures for defense, waging this war on all fronts simultaneously at a relatively small cost to herself.

Then he went on to say that so far the Soviet efforts to undermine the democracies appear to be succeeding and offered as a solution the proposition—and note this, Mr. President—that this Atlantic Pact treaty be used as a base for the development of a federal union, of a political union, of the signatory nations—in other words, a semisuper state.

Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious where this trend is leading, and it is time that the United States Senate refuse longer to lend its support to policies which get us more deeply involved with every day that passes in commitments under which we are rapidly losing any power of self-direction.

The time has come for a clarification of the basic intentions of this administration, where they put all the facts out in the open for us all to see.

For myself, as matters now stand, I believe it is the duty of the Members of the United States Senate to carry out an exhaustive investigation of the policies and personnel that have brought the Chinese catastrophe upon us.

And that we serve notice now to the President and to the other signatory powers of the North Atlantic Pact that we are determined to straighten out the mess we are in, put solid ground beneath our feet once more, and clarify the areas wherein lie our crucial interests and security before we commit ourselves to the further squandering of American financial, economic, and military resources.

This road—the road we are traveling—can only lead to a deeper involvement in the vicious power politics in which we are already caught, and the final destruc-

tion of our form of government and our way of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article by George Sokolsky published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Just before each of the international conferences, a terrific advertisement campaign is launched upon the American people to convince them that this is the conference to end all conferences, that a sure and lasting peace is about to be achieved, that whatever money we have to pay to get that sure and lasting peace will be the final payment.

Well, it has never worked out that way. Instead, the American people have been lied to by their own officials, who made shameless as well as shameful agreements, condoning even slavery.

They have obligated us to enormous expenditures of our wealth to little avail either in the attainment of peace or in the rehabilitation of peoples.

Secret agreements, secret contracts, under-the-table arrangements have bound us, most of which we have only come to know by accident or by the course of events.

Therefore, let us watch this four-power conference distrustfully. The fact that the same people who produced Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, Bretton Woods, San Francisco, the various London and Paris talkfests, the British loan, are going to this one, counsels caution.

The point is not that they are unfit or unworthy; it is rather that we have been fooled so often by the same people.

For instance, you read in the newspapers that President Truman invited Senators STYLES BRIDGES and KENNETH WHERRY to the White House to discuss our China policy. The President singled out two Republicans for a private conference, the sort of thing that is usually limited to the highest level of Democratic leadership.

Actually, the President intervened in a quarrel within the Republican Party where Senators BRIDGES and WHERRY gave Senator VANDENBERG a going-over on the subjects of China and Germany, Senator VANDENBERG having maintained the State Department position, which is as untenable as it is dangerous for the welfare of this country.

So the President took time off to try to convince the Republican Senators that it was Chiang Kai-shek, and not Generals Stilwell and Marshall, advised by John S. Service, Owen Lattimore, Lauchlin Currie, John Carter Vincent, W. Walton Butterworth, Jr., and several representatives of the Treasury Department suspected of Communist Party associations, who confused that situation.

The President was drawing a red herring across the trail.

Apparently, he failed to convince Senators BRIDGES and WHERRY, who are still hammering away at getting at the truth of the China and German situations, just as Senator PAT McCARRAN is demanding the truth and calling for an investigation of both problems.

The President and the State Department seem to resent congressional intervention in these matters, although when they think it might help them they arrange for a congressional committee to go somewhere to see for themselves, as they did with the delegation led by Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER, in anticipation of the organization of ECA.

Neither the President nor the State Department has favored a congressional investigation of our far eastern policies on the spot.

In fact, I heard from China that during two recent trips to the Far East, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, our leading military authority in that field, was importuned by Chiang Kai-shek to meet him, Chiang offering to go anywhere on Chinese soil for the purpose.

But Wedemeyer was not permitted to see Chiang, to hear his side, to listen to a proposal. In a word, we insist upon being blind, deaf, and dumb.

It is interesting, in this connection, to note that the postponements in the Alger Hiss trial are requested by our Government. Were that trial held, it is beyond doubt that information would be disclosed which American officials prefer to have kept secret from the American people.

Alger Hiss' defense, if the charges stand, may be that he followed instructions, he being on a subordinate level. What were those instructions and who gave them and why did the Government suppress the Chambers-Hiss story, of which they had full knowledge for 10 years?

So, let us beware of the four-power conference, a secret session, and support Senator PAT McCARRAN's investigation. We need to know the truth.

This country is still the property of the American people, and the officeholders are still employees accepting our wage.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, and Mr. COUDERT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message notified the Senate that Mr. LOVRE had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, vice Mr. RICH, excused.

The message also announced that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3997) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "A," offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], on page 58, line 8, to strike out "\$6,063,000" and insert "\$7,063,000."

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Baldwin	Kefauver	Neely
Bricker	Kem	O'Mahoney
Butler	Kerr	Pepper
Capehart	Kilgore	Reed
Chapman	Knowland	Russell
Cordon	Langer	Saltonstall
Donnell	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lucas	Sparkman
Frear	McCarthy	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	Taft
Green	McGrath	Thye
Hendrickson	McKellar	Tydings
Hill	McMahon	Wherry
Hoey	Martin	Wiley
Holland	Maybank	Williams
Humphrey	Millikin	Withers
Ives	Morse	Young
Jenner	Murray	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Idaho [Mr. MILLER and Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of being present at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are excused by the Senate for the purpose of attending sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations holding hearings on the North Atlantic Pact.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECKON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY],

the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment "A" and my amendment "C," which I now submit, both of which are offered by me in behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the amendment "C" of the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, in line 14, it is proposed to strike out "\$150,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$350,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota that his amendments "A" and "C" be considered together? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, these amendments deal with rural electrification. I am delighted that the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is in charge of this bill, is here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from North Dakota does not mean to infer that the Senator from Georgia has not been here throughout the consideration of this bill. I have been here at all times during its consideration.

Mr. LANGER. I said that I am delighted that the Senator from Georgia is here, so that I can discuss this matter with him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that I originally went to the distinguished Senator from Georgia and tried to get him to agree to report the amendments from the committee. The Senator from Georgia is a very good friend of agriculture and a very good friend of the REA; and I was somewhat surprised when he would not accept these amendments. It is my considered opinion that the reason why he has not accepted them is that I have been unable to make perfectly clear to him exactly what the amendments would do for the farmers of the United States.

Mr. President, there are really three classes of farmers who are concerned with the REA. First, there are the farmers in States where 9 out of 10 farmers already have REA.

As a matter of fact, there are four States which have no REA at all, because those States were thoroughly electrified before the establishment of REA.

Today in the States of California, Connecticut, Idaho, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington more than 95 farmers out of every 100 already have REA.

Then we have States which at present need REA very much. In Alabama, ap-

proximately 40 out of every 100 farmers do not have REA. In Florida, only 65 farmers out of every 100 have REA. In Iowa, approximately 20 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA. In Kansas, 50 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA. In Kentucky, 50 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA. In Louisiana, 45 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA; in Mississippi, more than 60 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA; in Minnesota, 31 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA; in Missouri—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do those figures mean that the number of farmers indicated out of every 100 do not have electricity of any kind on their farms?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct; they have neither electricity nor power of any kind, unless they have a small generator that is turned by a windmill or unless they have a Delco plant. However, I am talking about electricity and power.

I say to my friend the Senator from Michigan that in the United States 2,000,000 farm homes are without electricity of any kind. I have here the exact figures bearing on that situation. In other words, today our country is only a little more than one-half electrified.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator from North Dakota started to give the figures for Missouri, and I shall be pleased if he will do so.

Mr. LANGER. Missouri is a little more than one-half electrified, the figure being 53.4 percent.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mississippi is only a little more than one-third electrified; in Nebraska, only 43 farmers out of 100 have REA; in Nevada, 41 farmers out of 100 do not have it; New Mexico is less than one-half electrified; in Oklahoma, only 44 farmers out of 100 have REA; in South Dakota, only 23 farmers out of 100 have REA; in Tennessee, only 50 out of 100 have REA. Texas is only two-thirds electrified; West Virginia is just a trifle more than one-half electrified; in Wisconsin, 15 farmers out of every 100 do not have REA. In North Dakota—I call these figures particularly to the attention of my distinguished friend—not quite 23 farmers out of every 100 have REA.

It will be noticed by examining the figures that the areas lacking REA are generally concentrated in two sections of the United States. I have before me maps which have been prepared by the REA. From them it will be observed that the lack of electricity is concentrated in the north Plains area and in the Southern States, such as Mississippi and Arkansas. Anyone who is interested in the matter and who wishes to examine the maps, will note from an REA map for June 30, 1937, which I now have before me, that in States such as Montana and Alabama there was practically no REA at all, at that time.

The map for 1940 shows how REA had been developed up to that time, although

it still was lacking in many of the Southern States.

The REA map for 1944 shows how the REA was then concentrated in the East and in the middle section of the country, but was almost totally lacking in the north Plains area.

Finally, Mr. President, I have the map for 1947. It will be noticed that very little was done between 1944 and 1947. That was due primarily to the lack of material. Most of the supplies had been used during the war. It was impossible to obtain a conductor or a transformer. The result was that construction was very much delayed.

The pending bill, on page 58, in line 9, provides as follows:

For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5 of said act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 6 thereof, \$350,000,000—

Three hundred and fifty million dollars, offhand, looks like a large amount of money—

to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act, and such additional amounts, not to exceed a total of \$150,000,000, to be borrowed under the same terms and conditions if and to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1950.

I call the attention of my distinguished friend from Georgia to the peculiar situation which we face. I desire to cite the difference between conditions in North Dakota and certain of the other north Plains States and the conditions in the South. The only way I can do that, to make absolutely certain the Senator has the best possible proof of what I am saying, is to quote Claude Wickard, the man who has charge of REA, in whom I am sure the Senator from Georgia has confidence, as I have. I think Mr. Wickard has done a very fine job. I call the attention of my distinguished friend to an ordinary newspaper clipping, from a little newspaper published in Oliver County, N. Dak., stating what must be done by farmers in the county in order to obtain REA. It is typical of the situation in Montana, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas and other States. It says:

The Center Construction Co., of Center, N. Dak., arrived at Hazen on Thursday morning and immediately started to string copper conductor on the 3-phase line north of Emil Malke's farm. About six farm folks of that area turned out to assist in stringing this conductor. With the high snow banks and deep snow it was very difficult to do without the aid of the farmers of this area. They assist in carrying the four heavy strands of wire up and above the snow banks over to the poles where the linemen climb poles and hoist the wire on up to the crossarm. It was felt that by getting this strung over some of the pot holes and lakes that would be filled up with water as soon as the snow melts that there would be no further delay in energizing the area north of Hazen, and toward Pick City.

In the South it is possible to dig post holes throughout the year. In that area there is no snow, such as there is in the north Plains area, to cause a delay of 3, 4, or 5 months in some years in carry-

ing on any construction work at all. Our construction work must be done within a period of 5, 6, or 7 months, depending upon the weather.

As I said a moment ago, anyone reading the bill could say, "Why, there is \$350,000,000. That means there is going to be ample money to take care of the Southern States as well as the States in the north Plains area." But how is the money to be divided? Certain States, such as Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, and others, are less than one-half electrified; in some instances, only one-fifth. How much of the \$350,000,000 would those States get? How much would it be possible for them to get under the bill? Mr. Wickard had this to say on the subject:

I shall now show how the REA program works. The amount which REA is authorized to lend annually is fixed by Congress, and REA then borrows the amount of its loan authorization from the United States Treasury.

We begin, in the event the bill is passed, with an appropriation of \$350,000,000, which is available for REA loans. Proceeding now to the north Plains area, the quotation continues:

Half of the amount available for loans in any given year—

That is, \$175,000,000 of the amount—

is reserved for loans in the various States on the basis of the proportion that each State's unelectrified farms bear to the total number of unelectrified farms in the country.

We can imagine the small amount of money any particular State will get.

The other half of the fund may be used for loans at the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State or Territory.

I want to make it plain to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the States about which I am talking are suffering from another great handicap in comparison with the States that now have REA. The States in the latter category got it when the price of materials was low, when it cost to build REA but half as much as it costs today. I have the figures to show exactly the difference in cost. In some instances the cost has risen more than 115 percent—again referring to figures furnished by Mr. Claude Wickard. In other words, let us assume that the State of Connecticut is electrified 100 percent, and that the State of Kansas today wants to construct a line similar to the one in Connecticut. Because of the increased cost of materials, the cost of the line in Kansas would be 115 percent more than the cost of the line constructed in Connecticut originally.

I think it important to consider the situation of the north Plains States, to show the desperate plight in which they find themselves. Let us take North Dakota and South Dakota, which are typical of certain of the other States, although they happen to be at the bottom. Of them it is said:

Although good progress is being made in bringing electric power to North Dakota farms, the State lags far behind most other States in the percentage of farms served by electric lines.

This situation is brought out in a report released by the Rural Electrification Administration to the North Dakota Extension Service.

According to the tabulation, made as of June 30, 1947, North Dakota ranks last in percentage of farms having electric service. The State had 58,689 farms, or 84.4 percent of its total number of farms, without electricity on this date.

South Dakota is in about as bad shape as North Dakota in percentage of electrified farms, according to the summary. In South Dakota 81.8 percent of the farms have no electric service. Minnesota has only 37.6 percent of its farms, which is less than the national average, without electricity. Montana has 58.6 percent of its farms without power lines.

The information supplied by REA to the North Dakota Extension Service shows two and one-quarter million farms in the United States, or 39 percent of all farms, without electric power lines.

It is pointed out that North Dakota has a challenging job ahead in bringing electricity to its farms. The REA states that a minimum of \$2,890,099 in new loans will be available to rural electric groups in North Dakota before June 30, 1948. Congress has made available \$225,000,000 in loan funds for national use during this fiscal year, of which half is allotted to the various States in direct proportion to their needs. The other half is available on a flexible basis, with no single State getting more than 10 percent of it.

Claude R. Wickard, REA Administrator, pointed out that "for the most part, the areas easy to electrify have been electrified. Only a policy of full area coverage, such as has been adopted by the more than 1,000 REA-financed cooperatives and power districts, gives assurance that the two and one-quarter million unserved farms ultimately will get power."

Mr. President, I wish to make very plain to the Senate what the farmers in the sparsely settled communities are up against. First of all, Mr. Wickard says that where there are many farms in a valley there is REA service, but where there is one farmer within a mile or a mile and a half, the service is not only more costly than formerly, but, in some instances, it is 115 percent as costly as was constructing a line in 1935. When the farmers are located in sparsely settled areas the cost to the individual farmer is much greater.

Mr. President, we are not asking for a gift. There is not a farmer in any of the States I have mentioned who wants something for nothing. All they are asking for is an opportunity to borrow money with which to get electricity installed on their farms. I have not the slightest doubt that some Senators here today, who were farm boys, were able to get an education because their mothers were able to save the butter money and egg money to assist in getting an education for their sons. But in the sparsely settled areas everything is against the pioneer mothers today. They have no electric lights; they have no electric power. Instead of being able electrically to operate their churns for the purpose of making butter, they have to do it by hand. Instead of having a deep-freeze in which to keep their meat so it will not spoil, and a place to keep their milk and cream where they will not get sour, they have to lower the cream and butter down into a well, where the temperature may be a little bit lower than it is on the

surface. I know the drudgery through which the womenfolk on the farm have to go when there is no REA service on the farms.

That is not all, Mr. President. The States to which I have referred have been losing population in the past few years. North Dakota has lost 121,000 persons, more than 21 percent of its population, during the past 6 or 7 years. In the State of South Dakota the situation is almost as bad. Kansas is third in the Nation in loss of population from the farms.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. In the State of Montana we have lost 12 and a fraction percent of our population. There are fewer persons in the State than there were 30 or 40 years ago. It is because of the lack of development and the failure to provide a balanced economy. People are leaving the State for that reason. After the First World War many of the boys who went to fight for their country did not return to the State, because there was nothing to which to return. The same situation followed World War II.

There is one point to which I should like to invite the Senator's attention. I appreciate the fact that he is making a very able argument in favor of the extension of the rural-electrification program, but one of the difficulties is the matter of getting transmission lines to bring the power into the back territories of the States. I hope the Senator will cover that point, because it is very important.

Mr. LANGER. I shall cover that point.

Mr. President, I want to refer to another matter, if the Senator from Montana will indulge me. There were millions of farm boys in the war. When they got over to barbaric Japan, as it was called, they found that more than 95 percent of the Japanese farmers had electricity upon their farms. When they went to Germany they found approximately 90 farms out of every 100 had electricity. When they reached Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, they found the percentage even higher than that, 97 or 98 farms out of 100 having electricity. Only farms in the most isolated portions of those countries did not have electricity.

One of these boys comes back home and wants to get married and to rent a farm. His girl says, "I want to go some place where I do not have to milk by hand, some place where I do not have to undergo the slavery and drudgery of farm work. So let us look around and find a farm which is electrified."

There are only 23 farms out of 100 in South Dakota, and 23 out of 100 in North Dakota, which are electrified. In Montana the figure is less than that. The young folks do not want to rent a farm which is not electrified. They read in the newspaper that in the State of Washington, where the Coulee Dam is located, 60 or 90 out of 100 farms are electrified. So the girl says, "Let us move out there where we shall not have to work so hard." Or they go to California, or to some of the other States

which I have named this afternoon, where electrification is approximately 100 percent.

That, Mr. President, is one reason why we have lost the population which my distinguished friend from Montana has mentioned.

I shall not take all afternoon, because I want to make my remarks as brief as I possibly can. Mr. Wickard testified before the committee. I want to refer to his testimony, to show, again, that \$350,000,000, which looks large in the beginning, does not amount to so much by the time Mr. Wickard gets through analyzing it. He says, "half of the amount available for loans in any given year is reserved for loans in the various States on the basis of the proportion that each State's unelectrified farms bear to the total number of unelectrified farms in the country. The other half of the fund may be used for loans at the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State or Territory."

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact, for example, that in the State of Connecticut, in the State of Rhode Island, in the State of Massachusetts, and in the State of West Virginia none of the money set aside by the Congress was used. Therefore, that money remained in the Treasury. In my opinion, the Administrator should have the power to use, in his discretion, any money not used, because it can readily be seen that when the Appropriations Committee meets, or when the political committee of either the Democratic or Republican Party meets, it gets a report from the REA Administration which says, "There is \$5,000,000, \$10,000,000, \$50,000,000 available which has not been used," when as a matter of fact that is not strictly true, because either it has already been assigned to projects which are in the course of being constructed or it is set aside for those States which are not going to use it, and the Administrator knows it is not going to be used. So this provision, that the other half of the fund may be used for loans in the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State, is not quite sufficient, and the law should be changed as provided in the bill I introduced.

I introduced a bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, providing that out of the money appropriated the Administrator should have authority to allot to the 10 lowest States—and some were in the South, one being Mississippi, and some were in the Great Plains area—more money than was allotted to the other States, which already had 60 or 70 or 80 or 100 percent electrification. I could not get the bill reported from the committee. The committee said they were going to take care of the matter, and they did try, and I wish to compliment the Senator from Georgia for endeavoring to take care of it by the additional \$150,000,000 recommended. On page 58 of the pending bill it is provided that \$150,000,000 may be used whenever the Secretary of Agriculture certifies that applications are pending.

Now I wish to make another matter clear to the Senate, namely, that one group of people are paying back to the Government every dollar they borrowed. Mr. Wickard says in the letter:

The REA borrowers have paid the Government \$176,301,661 in principal and interest. Of this \$18,504,792 was paid in advance—

It was paid before it was ever due—and less than 1 percent is delinquent more than 30 days.

Mr. President, that is a perfectly remarkable showing. The letter is so illuminating that I wish to read all of it. This REA is one Government agency of which every man, woman, and child in the United States can be proud. Mr. Wickard said in this letter, dated December 21, 1948:

We are pleased to send you the enclosed progress report on rural electrification. These statistics, based on the latest reports we have from our borrowers, show that the program is continuing to move forward in every part of the country at a rapid pace. During the first 9 months of 1948, REA borrowers set a new all-time record for miles of power line placed in operation. During this period a total of 108,806 miles of line was built. The size of the job is indicated by the fact that the 9-month total this year exceeds the entire year of 1947 by 13 percent. The number of consumers connected likewise is at a high level, and 1948 promises to be the best in this respect of any year since the program was inaugurated. A total of 368,150 consumers was connected during the first 9 months of the calendar year 1948.

Even with progress of such proportions, there is still a tremendous job to be done. As will be noted on page 4 of the enclosed bulletin, nearly one-third of the Nation's farms still lack electricity. It is estimated that 1,800,000 farms and an even larger number of other rural establishments are still unserved. The difficulty of bringing service to these people is recognized, but REA borrowers are facing up to the challenge of providing area-wide coverage. Applications for REA loans on hand and in process total approximately \$411,000,000, and applications are being received at the rate of about \$41,000,000 a month.

The problem of reaching the unserved rural people—

That brings up the very question propounded by the distinguished Senator from Montana a few minutes ago.

The problem of reaching the unserved rural people, many of them in thinly settled areas, is paralleled by the growing problem of providing adequate power for the new consumers as well as for those already being served. As the energy statistics on page 1 of the bulletin indicate, the consumption of power on farms is increasing at a rapid rate.

A most serious obstacle to further development is the current power shortage. REA-financed cooperatives in many areas are finding it difficult to obtain from the present suppliers the additional amounts of power they need.

Another problem with which REA borrowers are concerned is that of heavyening-up existing facilities to care for the growing loads.

Mr. President, that is one of the most important things in this entire problem. The people in western North Dakota get together to establish an REA, or the people in Kansas get together, as at Victoria, Kans., to build an REA. Let us assume they get an allocation of only

three or four million dollars. Then, of course, the generating plant will be too small, because as the load becomes heavy, as the months and years go by, it will mean that instead the capacity of the small generating plant will have to be increased, or it will have to be torn down and a new one put up.

We were up against that problem at Grand Forks, N. Dak. Two units were built. Three years later, as I remember, two more were added. Later those were torn down and a generator was built with about 10 units. Last summer it was found that did not begin to take care of the load, so \$6,197,000 was appropriated for a generating plant. In a conversation I had with the manager there he said that if a sufficient amount of money had originally been available so that the engineers could have said, "We are not limited by two or three million dollars, we are going to build the kind of generating plant that is going to take care of the whole area when all the farmers are hooked up," it would have meant a much larger appropriation at the beginning, but in the long run it would have saved the farmers a very large sum of money.

Mr. Wickard continued:

Indeed, many REA-financed co-ops are now engaged in this work to a considerable extent. During the last year, nearly every loan made to an existing borrower included an appropriate provision for increasing the capacity of present facilities.

While carrying forward the program of building new lines and improving facilities, REA borrowers are continuing their excellent financial record.

Mr. President, there was a time when it was not possible to get material, and I anticipate that the distinguished Senator from Georgia will say, "What is the use appropriating and setting aside a lot of money, when it is not possible to get the material?" I say to him that today it is possible to get all the material needed to build lines all over the United States of America. We had a full and complete hearing before our committee, and I have the report of the hearing here with me, if the Senator from Georgia or any other Senator is interested in referring to it. The record shows the names of those who were subpoenaed, and also the testimony they gave the committee. Every manufacturer of transformers appeared before the committee. We had before us every important manufacturer of aluminum wire or copper wire. We had before us, as I previously said, those who furnish the conductors, and we had before us those who furnish the transformers. There was only one small shortage, and that was a shortage of transformers for substations. Three months ago there was still a shortage of transformers. The testimony given at that time showed—and I have the testimony before me—that it might be a year before that shortage for the substations could be supplied. That testimony was given 3 months ago, so that shortage will be supplied in 8 or 9 months from now. At that time the testimony was that it might be at the most a year before the transformers could be furnished.

Mr. President, I simply cannot conceive that my friend the Senator from Georgia, who has done so much for the

farming population of America, would take the position that if we increase the amount from \$150,000,000 to \$350,000,000 we would do any harm. I say that because a reading of the bill will show that not one penny of that amount of money, assuming the increase to \$350,000,000 were made, would be spent unless "the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1950."

Let us view the situation in the most pessimistic light. Let us assume that the shortage of the large transformers should continue 1 or 2 months longer than I stated. Even so there is no reason why the lines from the individual farms cannot be built, so they can be energized immediately after the transformers are installed in the substations.

My other amendment would raise the administrative expenses from \$6,063,000 to \$7,063,000. If the loan authorization is increased it will mean that more engineers must be employed. I refer once more to the fact that we need a large number of engineers in the Great Plains area for the 6 or 7 months during the year when they can work. For the remainder of the year they can work in the South. During the time the Northern States have snow and cold weather it is almost impossible for the engineers to build REA lines.

Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate may accept my two amendments, which are being considered together, and help the farmers, chiefly those located in the sparsely settled areas, who are on their farms by themselves, widely separated from other farms and communities, where they badly need light and power, much more so than do those in more congested areas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I deem it unnecessary to state here that I have been interested in the program of rural electrification. I supported the first bill for this purpose which was ever introduced in Congress. It so happened that I was a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and handled on the floor of the Senate the legislation under which the Rural Electrification Administration is operating at the present time. I have served on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations during the entire life of the Rural Electrification Administration. In the years gone by, back in 1938 and 1939, I offered in the Senate committee amendments, which were brought to the floor of the Senate, to increase the loan authorizations for the Rural Electrification Administration. I do not know of any program inaugurated during the days of the so-called New Deal which has made a more permanent contribution to improving life in the United States than the rural electrification program. It has enabled us to keep upon the farms of the Nation the ambitious young men and women who were heretofore rushing to the cities because they could see their cousins who live in town enjoying the good things of life which were not available to them on unelectrified farms.

Mr. President, with that background, I wish to say that, in my judgment, the

Senate should not accept the amendments proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

It so happens that in this bill at the present time there are provided administrative expenses and funds for loans in excess of any amount which has ever been provided in any appropriation bill, or in any one year through the regular appropriation bill and by way of deficiency appropriations. The bill carries or makes available the sum of one-half billion dollars for rural electrification. Ardently as I believe in the program, I think it would be most unwise, almost to the point of folly, for the Senate to add \$200,000,000 additional to these authorized funds.

Mr. President, in addition to this one-half billion dollars, there has been allotted the sum of \$528,000,000 to rural electrification cooperatives which has not been drawn from the Treasury of the United States. Certainly, with this sum of more than \$1,000,000,000 available for the work program in expanding rural electrification during the coming year we would not be justified in accepting, or the Senate in adopting, the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are we to understand that there is over \$500,000,000 in the fund at the moment which has not been spent?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. And we are appropriating another \$500,000,000 under the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not a direct appropriation, I may say to the Senator from Indiana. It is a loan authorization. I think it occupies a somewhat different status from an appropriation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. But we are making available \$350,000,000 outright, with an additional \$150,000,000 which will be available in the event the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to the need of it, and that it can be wisely spent.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is above the \$500,000,000 which is now available from previous appropriations?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that there was a total of more than a billion dollars which has not been expended, which will be available if the fund of \$500,000,000 provided by the pending bill is approved.

Mr. CAPEHART. How much has been spent on REA since the beginning of the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The total authorization, not including the funds contained in the pending bill, is \$1,875,000,000 in round figures.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does that mean that up to this time we have spent \$1,800,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, because \$528,000,000 of that money has not yet been expended. There has actually been expended or advanced to the cooperatives \$1,220,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, we have accomplished the fine results we have today with the expenditure of \$1,250,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. \$1,220,000,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Now, with the money that is left over from last year—

Mr. RUSSELL. That is an accumulation. It is not all from last year.

Mr. CAPEHART. The accumulation the Senator spoke of, plus the \$500,000,000 contained in the present bill, will mean a total of nearly \$1,000,000,000, which is almost as much as the REA has used in 14 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, but, of course, it would stand quite a bit of explanation. There has been a very large increase in the cost of material and labor for installing REA lines. I suppose the increase in these costs is about as marked as it is in any other commodity on the American market today; but there is a very substantial sum of money available.

Mr. CAPEHART. One other question. Is it not almost impossible for REA to spend in the next 12 months \$1,000,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think they can spend it or will spend it, I may say to the Senator from Indiana, but because of the peculiar formulae under which these funds are allocated some States will be able to spend it all, while other States will not be able to spend it, and some of the money will eventually be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it is the able Senator's opinion that the \$1,000,000,000 available from this year's appropriation plus the money which has accumulated over a period of years is absolutely ample?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my judgment there is as much money available in the hands of the agency as the Congress ought to make available to any agency of this size at one time. That is my own view.

Mr. CAPEHART. Did the Administrator, Mr. Wickard, ask for more money?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; Mr. Wickard did not ask for more money. He was bound somewhat by the budgetary limitations imposed on any administrator. Mr. Wickard is an enthusiast for REA. I suppose that if all restrictions were removed, he might support the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. I do not know what his views are. I am giving my views. I think there is ample money in the bill for this purpose. As a friend of REA, who fought the battles of REA on the floor for 15 years, I think there is plenty of money available for REA for 1 year's expenditures.

Mr. CAPEHART. If it is impossible to spend \$1,000,000,000 in the next 12 months, what would be gained by appropriating more money?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it would result in substantial advancement in rural electrification. As the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, we do not now have shortages in equipment which slowed down the program for 2 or 3 years. That fact has contributed to the carry-over. Material was not available.

Mr. CAPEHART. The fact still remains that the money is available now.

Mr. RUSSELL. The money is available now. There are some shortages in equipment. I think there is now plenty of wire, and poles are available, but with respect to certain generator parts there is a shortage, and there will remain a shortage for perhaps 12 or 15 months.

Mr. CAPEHART. The REA has spent only one and a quarter billion dollars in 14 years. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think so. It started in 1935. As I recall, the law was enacted in 1935.

Mr. CAPEHART. That would make it 15 years. If the REA has spent only one and a quarter billion dollars in 15 years, and it will have available after this appropriation, plus the appropriation for loan purposes, \$350,000,000, plus \$150,000,000 authorized, or a total of \$500,000,000, plus the \$500,000,000 which has been accumulated, or a total of a billion dollars, that certainly should be enough for 1 year. It has spent only \$1,250,000,000 in 15 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is sufficient. For that reason I am opposing the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator realizes, does he not, that at the present time unemployment is developing in many of the areas involved in this debate? It seems to me that if it is possible at the present time to expand rural electrification in any areas because of the fact that material is now available which has not been available during the past 3 or 4 years, there is no reason why the States which have lacked development of rural electrification during the past 4 or 5 years should not now have the opportunity to go forward with their programs, which at the same time would afford relief in the unemployment situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not look upon the rural electrification as a make-work program. It contributes to the economy. I am delighted that it does add to employment in the country, but this would be a rather expensive method of providing work, because of the great costs involved in building the lines. I have the utmost sympathy with the States which are not up to the national average in rural electrification, but if we are going to be frank and not undertake to deceive ourselves, we must recognize the fact that the States which are deficient have only themselves to blame. Some of the States about which we hear so much today, including the State represented by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, as well as the State of South Dakota, did not inaugurate any program of any significance until 2 or 3 years ago, and, of course, they are behind the rest of the country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me inform the distinguished Senator from Georgia that when I was Governor of my State it was the first State in the United States to

adopt the program. The second REA project in the United States was built at Kindred, N. Dak., but we could not get the money. We came to Washington and tried to get it. The Senator is familiar with many of the good reasons why we could not get it. I am not condemning anyone. But the men who were here representing North Dakota at that time were not interested. I will concede that. However, our farmers got together, and the Kindred Cooperative is one of the largest in America. I assure the distinguished Senator from Georgia that we could not get the money. I have a farm located in that cooperative area. We begged for the money, but we could not get it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know the specific reasons why the Senator's State did not get the money; but I have kept up with this program since its inception. At least the allotments were not made to the State of North Dakota to which it was entitled under the division of funds provided in the authorization. I presume that that was for good and sufficient reasons which appealed to the Administrator. The Senator's State may have had the first REA cooperative in the United States, but if the Senator from North Dakota will check back on the figures he will find that there were several years when North Dakota did not make use of all the funds allotted to it in Washington under the authorization.

Mr. LANGER. The same situation prevails in South Dakota, Montana, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska. All through the plains States area the situation is almost identical. Mr. Wickard told us the reason why. He told us, for example, why Wyoming jumped from the forty-seventh State to the twenty-sixth. He stated that it was because in Wyoming there were thickly populated valleys, so he used the discretion which he has under the act, and put the money into Wyoming. Wyoming advanced and Nebraska went back. The figures will show the difference between Wyoming and Nebraska during the past 3 years. I assure the distinguished Senator that we did everything we could think of, at least during the time I was Governor, to get REA aid for our State.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am quite sure that the Senator did; but the fact remains that the percentage of farm electrification in the Senator's State is comparatively low. I do not carry the figures in my head, but, as I recall, it is much higher in Kansas and Minnesota than it is in the State of North Dakota. I am quite sure that the charts prepared by the Agency will bear out that statement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is it not possible for North Dakota and other States which are so low on the list to get sufficient funds from the \$1,000,000,000 which will be available to do what they want to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. They can get only the amounts to which they are entitled under the formula prescribed in the basic act. I do not know what those amounts are.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us change the formula, then, instead of appropriating more money.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that time and again the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has spoken about his interest in rural electrification and his efforts to obtain more money for his State and area. The fact that he has offered this amendment is proof of his diligence. I have served on the committee with the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and I know of his great interest in the problem. He has been energetic, both in the committee and on the floor, in getting sufficient funds. I do not believe that the mere fact that there happens to be a shortage in the Senator's State justifies making available \$200,000,000 which is not needed over the country as a whole.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the figures which appear in the most recent monthly publication of the REA. I also invited the attention of the Senator from North Dakota. He is either misinformed, or he does not grasp the facts.

On the 30th of June 1948, the loans approved in North Dakota were \$38,670,000. On February 28, 1949, 8 months later, the loans approved in North Dakota were \$64,122,000. That is an increase in 8 months of 70 percent. I do not know why the Senator from North Dakota would not be satisfied with that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Kansas has concluded his statement.

Mr. LANGER. I am perfectly aware of the fact that there was such an increase. A representative of the REA was in North Dakota, and we had 23 meetings. North Dakota is getting the money. When the REA spends the \$520,000,000—

Mr. REED. What is the Senator complaining about?

Mr. LANGER. I want to help Kansas. I want to help Nebraska. I want to help South Dakota. I want to help Montana. I want to help Mississippi.

Mr. REED. I thought the Senator was waiting about North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am not. I am talking about the other States. I want them to be taken care of in the same way that North Dakota has been taken care of. When this money is spent, in North Dakota, 79.9 farmers out of 100 will have REA service. But similar development is not occurring in South Dakota and some other States. I am interested in seeing that the other States also have a chance to borrow REA money. In my State the power companies have endorsed this program. They say they do not have enough money to build the transmission lines, and they are perfectly willing to have the REA build them and give them a chance to help out. The people want it; the power companies want it; everybody is in favor of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. And we will build it.

Mr. LANGER. I certainly cannot see what harm it will do to make a sum of money available to a group of farmers who organize a cooperative, so as to give them a chance to borrow the money. The Secretary of the Treasury says the amount of money available is not sufficient to meet the needs of the great number of applications which have been filed. Certainly these people should have a chance to borrow what they need.

We do not have a billion dollars available for this purpose. Mr. President, \$520,000,000 has already been appropriated.

For instance, let me read from a news item which I have before me now:

Two REA jobs total \$717,960.

That is the headline of an article appearing in the Renville County Farmer of March 31, being in reference to the North Central Electric Cooperative at Bottineau, N. Dak.

That money is a part of the \$20,000,000 which already has been allocated by REA.

Mr. CAPEHART. It has been allocated, but it has not been spent, and the facilities have not been completed.

Mr. LANGER. But in a majority of the cases the contracts have been let.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, magnificent progress is being made in this direction, but I think it would be most uneconomical and would tempt the administration to indulge in great extravagance if we were to add the proposed \$200,000,000 to the amount already recommended for this purpose.

The REA has undertaken to build many facilities; but we know that in many cases the cooperatives are not equipped to handle expensive machinery. If the proposed increase in the amount of money to be made available were made, the only change would be to permit the purchase of expensive machinery which the REA cooperatives are not generally equipped to handle.

When Mr. Wickard appeared before the House committee, he said:

When we drew up the budget estimates we estimated that we would only be able to loan about \$375,000,000 during this fiscal year.

That was the full amount of the new loan.

Then he said:

Now we have raised that estimate by \$50,000,000, to \$425,000,000.

The bill provides \$75,000,000 more than what Mr. Wickard estimated he could loan. However, he made a fairly good guess, because the figures which I secured this morning from the Rural Electrification Administration show that the applications being submitted are running a little less than \$42,000,000 a month. That is the total of applications which are being made. Of course, I do not assume that the REA will give every one of the cooperatives every dollar it requests. However, if that rate is maintained, and if the REA were to approve every application for 100 percent of the amount applied for, the amount now provided in the bill would just about be used up.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, and I apologize to the Senator from Kansas for having kept him on his feet so long.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. That is quite all right.

I wish to say that I think the rural electrification program in Kansas is coming along very satisfactorily.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia one question. There has been some talk and certainly some discussion in the press to the effect that the technical staffs of the rural electrification program probably were not adequately financed. What is the judgment of the distinguished Senator in regard to that matter, as respects the appropriations which are set forth in this measure? Will they be sufficient, in his judgment and in the judgment of the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to answer the Senator frankly. I say that of course this bill does not provide as much money as the REA wants for administration, but it provides more money than the bill last year provided. Last year the budget recommended \$250,000,000 for REA. The Congress allowed \$5,675,000 for administration, which as I recall was slightly less than the budget estimate, and was based on a \$250,000,000 loan authorization. However, with that administrative fund, the REA handled \$400,000,000 of loan authorizations which were made available to them.

This bill makes available \$6,063,000 for administrative purposes for the coming fiscal year, with loan authorizations of \$500,000,000. In my opinion that would keep approximately the same burden of work upon the administrative staff as it has at the present time. It is true that the bill this year will provide more money, but the REA is making larger loans. So the total effect will be that not a great deal more work will be involved. Somewhat more work may be required; for instance, no doubt more engineering work is required on a \$50,000,000 loan than on a \$40,000,000 loan.

So the number of loans probably will not be much greater, although the amounts to be authorized will be considerably greater. The result may be to place a somewhat heavier burden upon the administrative staff and the technical employees of the Rural Electrification Administration, but in my judgment, they will be able to come through all right with the \$6,000,000 provided in the bill for administration.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator. That is one of the things in which I was very much interested, because if the REA is allowed sufficient funds to cover the over-all situation in regard to loans, certainly the REA should be allowed adequate funds for the administration of the loans, by way of engineering work, and so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is a hard-working organization. In my judgment, it does a good job. I wish to see it obtain adequate funds without having the Congress be extravagant in advancing funds to it.

I intend to be perfectly frank with the Senator, and I say that I think the administrative staff of this agency does work somewhat harder than do the administrative staffs of some other agencies

of the Government, but I doubt very much whether the health of the members of the REA staff is being endangered by the amount of work that is done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there has been so much misconception, misapprehension, and misunderstanding about this matter that I shall take the next 10 minutes to see if some of it can be cleared up.

I trust that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will agree with me that a burden rests upon a local community to form a cooperative under the proper rules and regulations and standards, before it will be eligible to receive a loan. If a State does not move fast enough, the States which move faster will originally benefit in that way. I have no doubt that the trouble in North Dakota was because of slowness and delay in taking action in that respect.

The Senator from North Dakota has not used quite correctly the figures to which he has referred. The Senator from Georgia has touched upon that point.

One billion eight hundred and seventy-five million dollars has been authorized. As the Senator from Georgia knows, there is a lag between the time of the making of the authorization by Congress and the time when the loans are approved, and a further lag between the approval of the loan and the actual expenditure of the money.

As against the \$1,875,000,000 which has been authorized, as of February 28 of this year—and let me at this point ask the Senator from Georgia, who read from a letter, when he obtained from the REA the figures he used earlier today.

Mr. RUSSELL. These are figures as of May 6, 1948.

Mr. REED. I am using the last printed figure, I believe; but the Senator from Georgia used a later figure, which he received today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, as of May 6.

Mr. REED. But as of February 28 of this year—the figure for that date being the last printed figure available—the loans approved amounted to \$1,651,000,000. Congress had made an authorization of \$1,875,000,000. The REA had approved loans of \$1,651,000,000. The difference represents the lag between the amount of money authorized and the amount of money advanced or spent. After Congress makes the authorization—in this case, \$1,875,000,000—the REA has to approve the loans, which thus far has been done to the extent of \$1,651,000,000. There is a lag of more than \$200,000,000 between the authorization and the approval of loans. Furthermore, the funds advanced—that is, where the REA furnishes the cash to go ahead and do the work—amounted to \$1,152,000,000 on February 28. The program is moving as fast as it reasonably and efficiently can.

I agree with every word the Senator from Georgia has spoken in the course of the debate. I have served with him throughout my years of service in the Senate. The REA has no better friend in Congress than the Senator from Georgia. He has done all that can be done. I have been delighted to help him,

I cannot claim to rank with him, but I have been a consistent supporter of REA.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to say the Senator from Kansas has been not only a consistent supporter, but he also has had a fine understanding of the problems of the local cooperatives.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I want to make it plain that I myself said at the beginning of my remarks, the Senator from Georgia is one of the best friends of REA we have in the United States. I am not criticizing him in any way whatever.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I did not take as personal criticism anything the Senator said.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia stated the facts. It is possible to get materials only as they become available. During the war it was impossible to get them at all. At times REA has been from 18 months to 2 years behind on transformers. Nothing could be done. The complaints which come to me in Kansas are not complaints about the progress of REA, or about its getting started. The complaints are that they are so far behind in some cases by reason of the shortage of materials. But they will catch up in the course of time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad the Senator brought out the facts regarding the shortage of materials. In a State where the population is not too dense, it means that many poles are required in order to construct a line to an individual home. The same thing is true with respect to wire and other materials. That means a greater pinch will be felt in such a State than will be experienced in more densely populated States. That is the trouble in South Carolina.

Mr. REED. About half the farms in Kansas are energized; but, Mr. President, one-half of that half is furnished by private utilities. The REA serves only about 25 percent of the Kansas farms; private utilities, 25 percent.

Mention was made of conditions in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The REA is not operating in Massachusetts at all, nor is it operating in Connecticut. It is not operating in Rhode Island at all. The reason is that the farms are small and they are already connected up with private utilities. There is a different situation in California, where 94.7 percent of the farms are connected up with electric energy, though California has but five REA cooperatives connected. Ninety-four percent of the farms in California are connected up; yet there are but six REA projects, which serve 7,000 farms. Of the millions of farmers in California, only 7,000 are connected up with REA. The rest of them are not furnished electric energy. A similar situation prevails in Colorado, which is energized 79 percent, yet there are but 32,000 REA customers.

Mr. President, I highly esteem the Senator from North Dakota, but he had just as well confine his sympathy to his own State. The farms in the State of Kansas are being connected up. Our State was a little slow in getting started, but the work is now progressing at full speed. The private utilities in Kansas have helped. One-half the farms in the State have electric energy, obtained in part from private utilities, that, with two or three minor exceptions, have cooperated almost perfectly. Nebraska, I think, is slow; South Dakota, I think, is slow; perhaps for the reason mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota in connection with his State. But there is nothing in the whole situation to cause concern. There is no earthly reason why the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota should be adopted. As the Senator from Georgia pointed out, between the authorization and the approval of funds, there is \$500,000,000 provided in the bill. I may ask the Senator from Georgia, is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount was \$528,000,000 as of May 5.

Mr. REED. Five hundred and twenty-eight million dollars is available. There is a sum in excess of \$1,000,000,000 to carry forward the program. It simply does not make sense to bring in a proposition to increase the authorization \$200,000,000. There is no possible need of it; there is no possible justification for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish that every Senator upon the floor would get it into his head that I am not here fighting for North Dakota alone. The cold-blooded record shows that in Kansas every other farmer is without light and power. If the senior Senator from that State is satisfied with that condition, so am I. If he is satisfied to let every other farmer go without light and power, that is all right with me. That is his own State. I am following his suggestion in keeping my nose out of the State of Kansas. I shall put my nose into the other 47 States.

Today there are 2,250,000 farms without light and power. I shall not stand on the floor of the Senate and see the poor farm women in those States slaving as my mother slaved, without light and power. I shall not stand here, seeing in mind mind's eye, poor farm women in West Virginia, Texas, South Dakota, North Dakota, or Georgia operating a churn by hand, when a small motor would do the work for them. I favor refrigeration of meat to keep it from spoiling. There are, of course, certain States that are in better shape than others. For example, I notice that in Virginia, a State of which the distinguished senior Senator formerly was Governor, there are far more farms electrified proportionately than in West Virginia—73 percent in Virginia, with only 50 percent in West Virginia.

But, Mr. President, are the poor farm women to blame because in some States the State officials went all out for REA, and in other States there were officials who reneged on their job? It seems to me it is the duty of a Senator to fight for the entire Nation and not simply for one State. I took care of North Dakota, Mr. President. Last November I traveled all

over the State. We held 23 meetings and had enormous crowds. The result was that the REA gave us approximately \$30,000,000. When that money is expended it will mean that approximately 80 out of every 100 farms will have electricity furnished by REA. I think that is a very good record. We shall get the other 20 percent, so that every woman who wants electricity will have a chance to have it. We shall certainly make it 100 percent if we can.

But, Mr. President, I am greatly interested in the other States—

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Does the Senator from North Dakota think that efforts to get REA service will be cut off? We shall continue them, shall we not?

Mr. LANGER. There are applications which are 9 years old. Some Senator made the statement that North Dakota was not on the job. I have here letters, thousands of them—

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LANGER. One moment. One question at a time.

I have letters showing applications made in 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943. I have one here which is typical, if the Senator will bear with me a moment.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. This letter is from a group of farmers in Ransom County, N. Dak., requesting me to apply for action on their applications made in 1945.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I can show the Senator letters with reference to applications made in 1939, 1940, and 1941.

Mr. LANGER. The letter says their applications were made in February 1945, at which time they paid \$5 and that—no action has been taken, to our knowledge.

I will show the Senator the names.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Does the distinguished Senator feel that with the impetus which has already been given, and the reception which this great improvement has received all over the rural areas of the United States, within the next 3 or 4 or 5 years some of the States which the Senator has mentioned will be in the 80- and 90-percent columns?

Mr. LANGER. In 4 or 5 or 10 years, or 50 years—

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I said, 3 or 4 years.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that a group of people who made application in 1941, 1942, and 1943 are entitled to action?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator says they have not received action. That was not because the money was not available, was it?

Mr. LANGER. It was not until last year, through action of the Eightieth Congress, that, for the first time, there was sufficient money. In the Eightieth Congress there was a recommendation

from the President for \$300,000,000. My distinguished colleague [Mr. Young] and I went before the committee and got \$100,000,000 more than the President had recommended.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Whatever the reason may be that the persons to whom the Senator has referred did not receive the service, it was not because the funds were not available.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Materials were not available.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was brought out a moment ago that there is \$500,000,000 available at the moment, in addition to the appropriation now requested.

Mr. LANGER. May I once again make it clear? I thought I had previously made it clear—

Mr. CAPEHART. The money has been allocated, but has not been spent.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. That is because of the fact that the cost has increased enormously. In Mr. Wickard's testimony he stated that in 1939 the average cost of stringing a power line was \$744 a mile. Today the cost of a mile of line is approximately \$1,600, representing an increase of 115 percent.

The people in Indiana are very fortunate. Ninety-six and a fraction percent of them have REA service. I know that, as a Senator, the Senator from Indiana is anxious to see persons in other States get light and power on their farms. The farmers of Indiana got their light and power at a time when it was possible to construct a line for \$744 a mile.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in favor of REA, and always have been in favor of it. I enjoy it on my farm. I have both REA service and privately owned electrical service. But the big question in my mind is, How can REA spend more than a billion dollars in the next 12 months?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Wickard answered that in his testimony. I asked him at the time of the hearing, and he said:

We could use that, and more, too, if we had it.

That was his response to my question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presume he could use enough money in 1 year to put power on every farm, which we hope eventually to do, but I am just wondering—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Wickard said he was satisfied with \$300,000,000. We increased that amount \$100,000,000 more. I have not the least doubt that Mr. Wickard is satisfied with what he requests now. He has certainly told me nothing to the contrary. One year ago the amount was increased 25 percent. Practically all the money was allocated.

Last December there were sufficient applications to take more than the \$400,000,000 allotted last year.

Mr. President, I now come to another point which I think is very important. That is the matter of power. It is necessary to build generating plants. In one instance it cost approximately \$6,000,000, and in another case it was \$4,000,000.

The money is not being thrown away. If the Secretary of Agriculture should certify that there are no applications, and no one wants the service, there will be no harm done. But why not make the money available?

Again, Mr. President, I want to say that I know the fine record of the Senator from Georgia. I did not intend in the slightest degree to criticize him. I do not know of a better friend of REA than is the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator from North Dakota that it is simply a matter of a difference of opinion between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota as to how much money should be available in 1 year for a purpose which we both agree is most worthy and meritorious. The Senator from North Dakota believes that REA needs more money. I think it has more than it can spend. In my judgment, when the question comes up next year there will probably be approximately \$145,000,000 which will not have been spent by the REA.

Mr. LANGER. In 1945, 1946, and 1947, after the war, we could not get materials. Now, for the first time, materials have become available. Now, for the first time, we need a large group of engineers. I have here the list of the force they have. The REA staff currently numbers about 925 persons, of whom 680 are employed in Washington and 245 outside. REA has field offices.

What happened in the Eightieth Congress. The junior Senator from Kansas inquired about personnel. It is a fact absolutely definitely established before our Civil Service Committee that there is not enough personnel. Last year, for example, with the shortage of engineers, in North and South Dakota and Minnesota there was one engineer. To me it seems utter nonsense to say they have enough personnel when, as a matter of fact, there must be a blueprint of every single line of REA that is built because that is the only basis on which they can borrow money. The engineers have to be available to lay out every single post. They can use local help, and have in some instances, but in the last analysis the engineer who is selected by the local REA and finally approved in Washington is a man who has to sign up before a loan is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The REA administrative funds are not used for paying engineers.

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon; the testimony of Mr. Wickard is here to that effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not care what he testified; the Senator from Georgia knows that the rural-electrification funds do not go to pay the engineer for any local cooperative.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. He is paid by the local cooperative.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are no Federal funds appropriated for that purpose. They may borrow money and they are

supposed to pay the engineer out of what they collect for the electricity, and I would be bitterly opposed to the Federal Government assuming the engineering costs of the local cooperatives. I am not in favor of giving the cooperatives engineering service.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the local cooperative hires the engineer and pays him?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. But he has to be confirmed in Washington?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct, but it does not take any great amount of administrative money to check to see if he should be approved.

Mr. LANGER. The engineers in Washington are paid out of the administrative funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. The REA man who approves the blueprints is paid here, but the engineer actually working for the cooperative is not paid out of the administrative funds, he is paid out of the cooperative funds.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Wickard says:

The Engineering Division is responsible for all REA activities pertaining to engineering advice and assistance to borrowers in the design, construction, and technical operation of rural electric systems.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, but this matter has been pretty well standardized. I think there are rural electric cooperatives in every State of the Union except two, and everything is pretty well standardized. I am not saying anything disparaging about the engineers of the REA. They have done a superlative job, but those in the field with the cooperatives have no connection whatever with the administrative funds of the agency in Washington.

Mr. LANGER. Last year they did not have a sufficient number of engineers in Washington, according to the testimony of Mr. Wickard.

Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that last year the President recommended \$300,000,000 for REA. The amount was increased by \$100,000,000. But what did the Eightieth Congress do? It took away from administrative expenses \$600,000. The result was that Mr. Wickard found himself with not enough money to pay his engineers and his other help. As I now remember, 172 were released, or quit, or were not paid enough money and did not remain. As a consequence, all over the Great Plains area, which includes Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, and Montana, the REA work was at a standstill. One reason why there is \$528,000,000 available in approved loans today is because of the action of the Eightieth Congress which cut \$600,000 from the administrative expense appropriation, so that no engineers were available. Contracts were let, but it was not possible to get the work done.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator should certainly not point the finger of responsibility at me. I led the fight in the committee, and the Senate restored the budget estimates so far as the administrative funds for REA were concerned, and it was done on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. But when we got into conference, we ran into almost in-

superable difficulties and were compelled to yield on some of the funds. The REA was overstretched somewhat, because I do not think it had quite so much surplus as some other agencies had. So the President sent supplemental estimates recommending additional appropriations for administrative expenses, and the Senator from Georgia battled most valiantly, in his own opinion, for such appropriations, and managed to secure a great deal of the supplemental appropriations. So the Senator from Georgia was not responsible for the reduction in the administrative expenses.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say again that I praise the Senator for what he did. I have said now three times that he is one of the best friends the REA has.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that, but I thought the Senator had forgotten what he said before. I assure the Senator that I did all in my power, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, to see that the REA's administrative funds were protected.

Mr. LANGER. I confirm that. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas asked about having enough money for administrative expenses. When the Eightieth Congress got through, we were about \$600,000 short. The result was that the projects were not completed and the works in the Great Plains area were at a standstill.

The Senator from Kansas says that we have the money now. But that money should have been spent. Instead of engineers being taken away, they should have been out in that area, and we would have had the money spent, whereas now we will have to wait 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 months, perhaps, before the money can be spent.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Do I understand correctly that the Senator offers two amendments, one to add a million dollars, or a little over a million, to the figure "\$6,063,000" in line 8, page 58, and perhaps to make an addition to the figure "\$150,000,000" in line 14, page 58? What is the amount of the addition?

Mr. LANGER. Two hundred million dollars more.

Mr. PEPPER. If I understand correctly, the larger part of the Senator's amendment, that is, the \$200,000,000 item he would add, in the first place, is not a grant of funds, it is a loan. In the second place, these funds are loaned upon the same basis on which other loans are made. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield further, am I to understand that these loans not only will be made upon the same terms and conditions upon which other loans are made, but also shall be made only "to the extent that the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify, from time to time, to the Secretary of the Treasury that such additional amounts are required during the fiscal year 1950, under the then existing conditions, for the expeditious and orderly development of the program"?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Florida is exactly correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator think, then, that this is just a loan that is in the nature of a capital investment for a public improvement of a sound character and a useful purpose, and that the limitations that are imposed thoroughly protect the public? That is to say, no loan is made unless the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to the Treasury that the funds are needed, or, to use the language of the amendment, required for the orderly and expeditious development of the program in the next fiscal year. If all these safeguards are thrown around this advancement of Federal funds as a loan, can the Senator see anything but benefit to the public interest in such additional funds being made available?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished friend that nothing but benefit could accrue to the public. It is not fair, in my judgment, for anyone to say that the farmer has as much money now or even more than he had a year or 2 or 3 years ago. Does not the Senator realize that the REA is now loaning money to farmers to wire their houses? We have more than 6,000,000 farmers in submarginal areas. The testimony given a few days ago was that 2,000,000 of them make in the neighborhood of four or five hundred to six hundred dollars a year. They have no money with which to wire their houses.

I read from a letter I received from Mr. Wickard a short time ago:

This is in response to your letter dated February 14, 1949, regarding an inquiry which you have received from Mr. Leo Otte, Verona, N. Dak., concerning the possibilities of obtaining a loan to finance the costs of wiring his farmstead for electric service.

Why should not a farmer be able to borrow money to wire his house? Mr. Wickard continued in his letter:

The Congress, in passing the Rural Electrification Act of 1939 and subsequent amendments to the act, charged REA with the responsibility of lending funds to rural people through its borrowers at low-interest rates, to speed the wiring of rural farmsteads and the purchase of plumbing and electrical equipment.

Loans made to borrowers for this purpose bear the same rate of interest as all other REA loans, 2 percent. The Rural Electrification Administration has set 4 percent as the interest rate which its borrowers may charge members on all installation loans.

Installation loans approved by the borrower to its members are subject to the following terms:

So, in addition to all the other things REA has done in the past, we find that they are now lending farmers who are poor and destitute, who live on submarginal lands, many of whom are broke, some of whom we know have not had a crop in 5 years—they are lending them money so they can get electricity and power in their homes and live like decent human beings.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to join with what the Senator from North Dakota has said, that there has been no champion of this cause who has been more

diligent in its behalf and furtherance than the able junior Senator from Georgia, and we all realize that any limitations imposed upon the Senator from Georgia come not from his own inner impulses but probably from external circumstances over which he has at present no effective control.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida for his kindly comment, but I feel under no restraints here other than those dictated by sound judgment and the information that is before me. When the Administrator of this fund himself comes forward and says he can use but \$475,000,000, when applications are running at a rate of only \$42,000,000 a month, and when the Rural Cooperative Association, which certainly has not been backward in seeking to benefit the local cooperatives and the local farmers, asks for only \$450,000,000 to be allocated for loans, and I find \$500,000,000 in the bill, I think it would be an utterly vain and futile gesture to increase that amount. That is the reason I am opposing the Senator's amendment. I am not opposing it because I feel under any restraint by reason of any action of the committee. I have never hesitated to be frank with any committee of which I have been a member. I simply do not think the REA can handle any more than \$500,000,000.

I appreciate the Senator's argument as to limitations placed on the Secretary of Agriculture. I think that if we are going to increase the amount at all we might as well take off the limit. In such event I do not see any reason why we should limit it to \$200,000,000 more, as proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. Then we ought to say that as much money as the Secretary of Agriculture believes can be expended on rural electrification should immediately be authorized to him by the RFC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator thinks that should be done, I will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think any such thing should be done. I do not think the REA can spend the money proposed to be given to it. I like to be somewhat orderly in my approach to the consideration of such bills.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Georgia show me the testimony of Mr. Wickard on the subject?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to read it to the Senator and then hand it to him.

When we drew up the budget estimates—

I might say that certainly no one could charge this administration, or the administration which preceded it, with not being interested in the rural-electrification movement, and with not having dealt very generously with it.

Mr. Wickard testified before the House committee. We did not have him before the Senate committee because there was no request made for an increase, and we did not propose to reduce the amount allowed by the House. So we did not

invite Mr. Wickard to appear before the Senate committee.

When we drew up the budget estimates, we estimated that we would only be able to loan—

He used the word "only"—

we would only be able to loan about \$375,000,000 during this fiscal year. Now we have raised that estimate by \$50,000,000 to \$425,000,000.

Then we have here the resolution adopted by the association of all the REA cooperatives who met together. Certainly they have vigorously championed the cause of rural electrification. That association is composed of men who spend their time working for rural electrification. They are directors of the small farmers' cooperatives that have done such a wonderful work. Three thousand six hundred of them were gathered in New York, and adopted the following resolution.

Be it resolved, That this association urge the Congress to authorize not less than \$450,000,000 for the rural electrification program for the fiscal year 1950.

The bill contains \$50,000,000 more than the association of cooperatives requested.

Mr. LANGER. I want to respond to that myself. The Senator will agree with me that a year ago the same bunch of cooperatives, when they met, set \$300,000,000 as the figure.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator is in error about that. They came here requesting \$400,000,000 and we allowed them \$400,000,000 just what they requested.

Mr. LANGER. But that was after the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] appeared before the Senator's committee and urged that the amount be raised to \$400,000,000. But the association at their convention adopted no resolution requesting \$400,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from North Dakota is not correct in that statement. The House placed the sum of \$400,000,000 in the bill last year, and the Senate committee did not reduce that amount. The Senator's colleague [Mr. Young] has been a very energetic and earnest advocate of rural electrification. He opposed very vigorously the effort which was made by a certain Senator, whom I shall not name, to cut the amount. A determined effort was made in the subcommittee of the Senate committee to cut the \$400,000,000. The motion to that effect did not prevail. The Senator's colleague was very active in opposing that motion. This year the bill provides \$50,000,000 more than the association by its resolution asked for.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to call attention to what I said last year, on February 17, 1948, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 1, page 1375, when we discussed the testimony given by Mr. Wickard. I said at that time:

Mr. President, all I can possibly do so far as REA is concerned is in my feeble, humble way, to keep on bringing to the attention of my colleagues on this side of the aisle the fact that Mr. Wickard says that at least \$1,000,000,000 is needed for the purpose. He did not testify to that directly, because he

said the President's budget called for \$300,000,000, but he frankly admitted that \$300,000,000 would not begin to take care of the amount which has been applied for. If Senators will read the exhibit showing the applications by States they will see that much more money has been asked for than is available.

Mr. RUSSELL. When was that testimony delivered?

Mr. LANGER. That testimony was given about in January.

Mr. RUSSELL. January of this year?

Mr. LANGER. No; January a year ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; of course it was true then. They had not had any construction at that time, and the Rural Electrification Administration had hundreds of millions of dollars which they were ready to apportion under loans and have approved. There is not a State of the Union at this very moment in which Rural Electrification projects are not going forward and being built under those funds, except, I believe, Connecticut and one or two others which have already been electrified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield the floor so the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may speak.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will speak but a few minutes. I read the testimony of Mr. Wickard following that which was read by the Senator from Georgia. I assume Mr. Wickard, in his testimony, is referring to the present fiscal year.

And I suspect that with our present force we will be out of funds in several States before the end of the year because we are now several millions ahead of what we thought we would be when we presented these estimates to the Budget Bureau.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. That indicates—

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows what that means, of course.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not sure that I do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Wickard means that under the formula in the Rural Electrification Act there is a limit on the funds which can go to any one State. There is a formula, and some of the States had demands slightly in excess of the funds available to them under the formula. He means that under the formula he will have completed the allocation of all the funds to which the States are entitled.

Mr. PEPPER. What I wish to call attention to is the fact that Mr. Wickard says:

And I suspect that with our present force we will be out of funds in several States before the end of the year.

That might not apply to all States, but at least it applies to several States. I do not know what the figures are, and I have not had an opportunity to get them.

I should like to know whether or not—and this is the pertinent question—the sums available under this item are equal to the total of the pending applications which are sound in character. Does the Senator from North Dakota have any facts on that subject?

Mr. LANGER. As I remember, the applications now being received total \$41,000,000 a month.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I read the figures a while ago. Figures have been submitted by the Rural Electrification Administration showing that applications are now being received in the amount of approximately \$42,000,000 a month. If that ratio is maintained throughout the year, and if the REA should approve every application submitted—which is most unlikely—we would be \$4,000,000 short with the funds contained in this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to get that information. I should like to make this observation. First the able Senator from Georgia tells us that if the present rate of applications continues, the funds in the bill will be about \$4,000,000 short.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator left out a very important limitation. I said if every application submitted is approved, 100 percent, which I contend is most unlikely.

Mr. PEPPER. Perhaps so. At any rate, approximately the amount of money available is being applied for. We can put it that way, and agree upon that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I have observed a similar situation with respect to veterans applying for admission to veterans hospitals. That is a question which we shall have to consider a little later, when we consider the continuation of the program of construction of veterans' hospital facilities. Someone in the Bureau of the Budget discovered that the number of applications outstanding represented only about a 12-day intake in the veterans' hospital system, and he naturally concluded that if in 12 days the entire waiting list could be taken care of, there was no need for new hospitals. But when we brought witnesses here from every one of the States affected—I think there were 19—without exception the representatives of veterans, responsible citizens in the communities, pointed out that the experience of the veterans was that the hospitals were so far behind in taking veterans in that many veterans simply did not apply for admission to the hospitals, because it took so long to get in.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We found that thousands of boys were being cared for in county hospitals, city hospitals, and local hospitals.

Mr. PEPPER. That situation was true all over the country. Some died in ambulances on the way to the hospitals. Some died in the vestibules of hospitals, and some in the waiting rooms. Some died who never could get any kind of medical attention because they could not get into the hospital until they became life-and-death cases. The average veteran thought to himself, "If I file an application, I do not know how long it will be before I get in." Human nature being what it is, he did not apply when he should have applied, and was not admitted when he should have been ad-

mitted to save his life. Incidentally, in many cases the Government was saved the expense of paying disability allowances for the remainder of the veterans' lives, because their condition became aggravated when it could have been helped.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Florida remember the testimony that in the State of South Carolina we had a daily average of approximately 500 ex-soldiers who were cared for in hospitals other than veterans' hospitals?

Mr. PEPPER. I remember that testimony very well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator also recall that in the State Hospital for the Insane we had a daily average of about 100 ex-soldiers?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I remember that very well; and I remember what an imperative showing of need I thought was made, not only in South Carolina, but in the other States affected.

From that principle, and that known experience, I deduce a similar situation in respect to REA applications. The people learn, in a general way, about what funds are available. When the impression exists, or the information is in their possession that funds are not going to be available for them, I do not believe they apply in as large numbers as they would if they knew the funds were available and that the only thing they had to do was to show that the project was sound, and have the Secretary of Agriculture certify that fact to the Secretary of the Treasury.

In this case all the Senator from North Dakota is asking is that a cooperative make a sound case, a case which satisfies the same standards, conditions, and requirements that any other case must meet, and show that the Secretary of Agriculture should certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the money is required. The language of this amendment is "required"; not "needed" or "desirable," but required, not in the remote future, but in the next fiscal year, the fiscal year 1950, for what purpose? For the expeditious and orderly development of the program.

If we open the door that wide to co-operatives throughout the country, it will not be a shortage of funds that will necessitate the declination of applications. For example, in my State a third of the farms still lack electricity. If we open the door, I believe that it will be simply a matter of passing upon the applications.

Mr. President, a great work has been done in the field of rural electrification. All honor and credit to every one who has had a part in it. I do not know of any greater contribution toward lightening the burdens of rural life and leading people from the congestion of cities back to the wholesomeness of the farms than what has been contributed by rural electrification to make living on the farm better and to lighten the burdens upon the housewife and make the home a more habitable place for the family. But, Mr. President, we still have a long way to go in this field.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This is not a gift, is it?

Mr. PEPPER. No, indeed. As was pointed out a while ago, this is a loan. The funds proposed to be made available by the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, if it prevails, are to be loaned upon the same terms and conditions as other funds provided under the law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that in the past the loans have been paid back on time?

Mr. PEPPER. I think everyone agrees that the record of repayment is phenomenally good. I believe the Senator from Georgia would testify that the record of repayment has been good.

Mr. RUSSELL. The record has been fine. Legislation enacted 3 or 4 years ago extended the time of repayment; but I believe that only about one out of a thousand of the cooperatives was in default, and the amount in default was very small. In many cases payments have been anticipated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to read one paragraph from a letter from Claude R. Wickard:

While carrying forward the program of building new lines and improving facilities, REA borrowers are continuing their excellent financial record. The table at the bottom of page 1 of the bulletin shows that borrowers have paid the Government \$176,030,661 in principal and interest. Of this \$18,504,792 was paid in advance of due date and less than 1 percent is delinquent more than 30 days.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. That is a fine testimonial to the character and responsibility of those who have applied for these loans.

Let me add another testimonial. The other day I was talking with one of the higher officials of the Federal Housing Administration. I may be a little in error in the figures I give, but the substance of what I shall say is true. In the course of the general conversation I said to this gentleman, "About how many loans did the Government make on homes under the HOLC during the days of the depression?" He said, "Oh, I think something over 2,000,000."

I said, "In other words, you saved something over two million homes from foreclosure and loss during those dark days, did you?"

He said, "Yes, something like that."

I said, "How much did you lose?"

He said, "Nothing."

I said, "Under FHA you have been building new homes, haven't you, for a great many Americans?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "How many have you built?"

He said, "Oh, I judge 2,250,000, or something like that."

I said, "How much did you lose on that operation?"

He said, "We have \$100,000,000 in the Treasury."

Mr. President, is not that a fine tribute to the wisdom of the program and the responsibility of the people who, in some instances, saved old homes which in many cases had been procured by the

sweat and sacrifice of those families, and in other instances built wholesome, sanitary, safer new homes? Yet neither program cost the Government anything, and in one case there was \$100,000,000 in the Treasury, as against future contingencies.

A few years ago many persons thought such a program could not be engaged in—the building of REA cooperatives, lending them money, and depending upon them to pay the money back. Yet the tribute which has just been read is the finest sort of testimony to their responsibility and character.

Mr. President, I spoke about the job ahead. Here is a paragraph from a statement which Mr. Wickard placed in the record when he was testifying on this matter before the House committee; I read from page 687:

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

REA borrowers, through REA financing and technical assistance, are working to bring about the electrification of an estimated 4,073,000 farm and other rural dwellings that are still without central station service, and to keep pace with the growing demands for power created by the sharp increases in farm uses of electricity. Many of the unserved farms are in areas most difficult to electrify, which materially increases the complexity of the task of reaching and serving them. The size and scope of the current REA program is indicated by the following data.

Then he told about the volume of applications on file. His statement is in support of what I said a moment ago about the increase in the number of applications when the funds are increased:

1. Volume of loan applications at an all-time high: Borrowers are applying to REA for loan funds at the rate of \$41,000,000 a month. As of November 19, 1948, REA had applications on hand or in the field totaling about \$422,000,000, the highest on record, notwithstanding the fact that loans made during fiscal year 1948 totaled \$313,000,000; also the largest on record.

I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia would be kind enough to give me the figures for the last fiscal year, as compared with the figures for the previous fiscal year, in respect to the funds available. He said \$313,000,000 of loans were made last year. My recollection is that the appropriation last year was larger than the previous one.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount available in 1948 was the same as in 1949, being \$400,000,000 a year, for each year.

Mr. PEPPER. What was the amount for the fiscal year 1947?

Mr. RUSSELL. Two hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the point I wish to make: For 1947, the funds available amounted to \$250,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was all we made available then, because during the war we had a tremendous, even stupendous, carry-over.

Mr. PEPPER. The point I was trying to make—and I think it is a sound one—is that as the funds available have increased, the number of applications and, of course, the number of loans have increased.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; the applications have greatly decreased.

During the war period, when equipment could not be obtained for these purposes, a large backlog of applications was built up. Since then, the applications have been fairly regular in number.

But during the war, various materials needed for this work—for instance, copper, and many other materials—could not be obtained, because they were needed for use in connection with the war and war industries.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator from Georgia has told us that the loan funds available in 1947 amounted to \$250,000,000, and in 1948 and 1949—

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the amount authorized in those years. I did not mean that was the amount available. Much more than that was available, because of the accumulation during the war period. However, we authorized \$250,000,000 of loans in 1947.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; \$250,000,000 in 1947, \$400,000,000 in 1948, and \$400,000,000 in 1949.

What is the amount carried in this bill? Mr. RUSSELL. \$500,000,000, in this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well; there was an increase of \$150,000,000 after 1947, so that \$400,000,000 was made available in 1948 and in 1949, and now there is to be an increase of \$100,000,000 over the amounts available in 1948 and 1949. The Senator from North Dakota proposes that we accelerate the increase, and make funds available as need may arise. That is the important point.

What about my State, where one-third of the farms are yet to be electrified?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Florida know the amount available for cooperatives in Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the figures before me. Does the Senator from Georgia have that information?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have it somewhere here.

Mr. PEPPER. But I know that many people in Florida are saying that they want more money available for REA expansion and extension, and I know that various cooperatives are appealing to my office to help them to obtain more funds for the expansion of their programs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Florida also knows that in many cases the funds have already been allotted to the cooperatives, but they simply have not had time to expend them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. As I understand, \$64,000,000 has been approved for distribution; and four million—

Mr. LANGER. I say it is not available to Mr. Wickard, for it has already been assigned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but I wished to say that the situation is not quite so bad as it would appear to be from the statement that 32 percent of the farms in Florida do not have electricity at this time. The people on those farms should not be entirely bereft of hope, because

in many cases funds are available to them. Although I cannot know the circumstances in every case, yet I am not afraid to say as a matter of fact that houses are being electrified on Florida farms today.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, there is no doubt as to that, and we are profoundly grateful for it. But I am speaking of the one-third of Florida farm homes that are not electrified, although the people on them want to have them electrified. I am asking about the situation in regard to them. Mr. President, when under this program we loan the money, rather than give it; when each loan has to be sound; and when the Secretary of Agriculture has to certify that the loan is required in order to bring about an expeditious and orderly development of the program in the next fiscal year, how can the Government be hurt? How can anything but the public interest be served by making the funds available within the range of reason—funds that are needed and are shown to be applied for by sound and responsible applicants.

Since such expenditures constitute capital outlays, since they will be for a useful public purpose, since the loans will be sound by hypothesis, and since the money loaned will be paid back, why not proceed with the program, at least within the bounds of reason, as fast as can be done in a sound and responsive manner?

Mr. President, signs of unemployment are beginning to appear. Even agricultural areas have their problems in that respect. If we are going to arrest that shrinkage of employment—which, if continued, will result in diminishing tax returns, and will tend to injure the whole public interest—how better can we serve the public interest than by providing for a sound outlay of capital public funds so as to permit cooperatives which make a satisfactory showing to obtain loans which will make possible the initiation or expansion of REA projects and programs?

A little while ago we for the first time liberalized the housing program so as to give aid to rural homes to which such aid had never before been available. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who always is active in aiding any matters affecting agriculture, as well as many other matters, had a great deal to do with that, and other Senators also did a magnificent job in that connection. The result was to extend aid for the first time to those at the bottom of the economic ladder, those in the submarginal class. By that program we made \$1,000 available to such persons, respectively, to permit them to put screens on doors and windows and to install running water in their homes, so as to make life a little easier for them. Why could not we also make it possible for those persons to electrify their homes?

Of course, those who are in the next higher class, those who might be classified as farming on marginal land or on land a little better than marginal land, also would like to be able to have electricity on their farms. In such a family, the wife who bends under the burden of family toil would like some succor, some means of lightening the burden and strain which are imposed upon her.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the present REA law provides that the Secretary may loan money to wire a home.

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Yet it is proposed to limit it to take care of comparatively few people, instead of 2,250,000 people who need it and want it.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Georgia asked about the situation in Florida. Loans amounting to \$22,000,000 were approved as of December 31, 1948. That is fine; that is helping a great deal; but what about all those who are not able to extend electrification to their farms? They are the ones I am talking about. I am sure that if we leave it up to the judgment of Mr. Wickard and the Secretary of Agriculture and the same authorities that administer the remainder of the program, they will be just as circumspect in the use of the funds as they would be in the use of the \$500,000,000 available under the item as it now appears before the Senate.

So I say to the Senator from North Dakota, just as he was the one to initiate the increase in funds to be made available for building new farm homes and repairing old, which rendered a great service to the farmers of the country, to the home life of rural America, and to the strength of the Nation, so he today is trying to bring light to the little homes where the screen doors and the screen windows he was instrumental in providing are shielding the health of the child against the ubiquitous mosquito or other infection conveyors. Just as he has tried to save the life and protect the health of that family, he is now trying to bring light to that little home, to dispel its very darkness and put in place of the flickering candle or the smoking lamp the virtues and the blessings of electrification, and even to bring within the reach of the humble farm wife the modern aids which make her burdens less onerous.

NOMINATION OF MON C. WALLGREN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, now that the nomination of former Gov. Mon Wallgren of the State of Washington as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board has been withdrawn by the President, I desire to make a brief statement, for the purpose of the record, of my action as a member of the Armed Services Committee in voting against the confirmation of Governor Wallgren.

Hearings were held at length by the committee on this nomination. I gave the utmost consideration of which I am capable to every phase of the qualifications of Governor Wallgren for this particular position. When I realized I had the deciding vote, on the Armed Services Committee, I felt keenly the responsibility that rested upon me. I made my decision entirely without political or personal bias and for what I regarded to be the best interests of our country. This position is of the most vital consequence in our national defense program. It is hardly second to the Secretary of Defense, as the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board has complete responsibility for the mobilization of the civilian forces of this country as a part of our national defense program. It is

of such consequence that when the position was established, the Congress provided that the person to serve as chairman must be confirmed by the Senate and be paid \$14,000 annually, only \$1,000 less than a Cabinet officer.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I participated in the passage of the Security Act of 1947, which created the National Security Resources Board, and was therefore fully informed of the importance of the position as affecting our national defense.

Confirmation by the Senate of appointments made by the President is one of the checks and balances of our system of representative democracy. It should not be performed as a perfunctory act, but each individual appointment should be scrutinized with the utmost care, and no person should be confirmed for a position for which he is unqualified. This is particularly true in this day when the responsibilities of our Federal Government have assumed such gigantic proportions.

After the most careful consideration of all the factors involved, I reached the definite conclusion, as did a majority of the committee, that former Governor Wallgren was not competent to perform in a satisfactory manner the duties of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Therefore, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I voted to lay this nomination on the table, and it was tabled by a vote of 7 to 6. This procedure has been criticized in some quarters, but, under the rules of the Senate, any committee has the right to table any matter before it, either a nomination or a bill, unless otherwise directed by the Senate itself. If a nomination is tabled, it can be brought before the Senate by a simple majority of those present and voting to discharge the committee—that is to say, if 49 Senators were present, constituting a quorum, 25 could vote to discharge the committee and bring the matter to the floor of the Senate. No such motion was made in the case of the nomination of Governor Wallgren, and it is, therefore, to be assumed that a majority of the Senate was not willing to discharge the Armed Services Committee.

In order to make my position fully clear, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, as a part of my remarks, a statement I issued on March 15, when this matter was voted upon by the Armed Services Committee, and likewise a statement showing the responsibilities of the position of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, MEMBER OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFIRMATION OF THE APPOINTMENT OF GOV. MON WALLGREN AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Throughout my service as a Senator I have never regarded my duties with respect to confirmation of a Presidential appointment as merely perfunctory. At the same time, I believe the President should have a wide latitude in his appointees, and I have frequently voted to confirm officials whom I would not have appointed myself, if the responsibility had been mine. The confirmation authority of the Senate is one of

the checks and balances of our democracy, and should be exercised by Members of the Senate temperately and courageously. No Senator should hesitate to oppose a Presidential nomination if he conscientiously believes the person appointed is unworthy, or incompetent to perform vital functions of major importance.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have approached the appointment of former Gov. Mon Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board without the slightest bias. In fact, my association with him in the United States Senate for 4 years was a very pleasant experience to me and, if anything, my bias would be in his favor.

We must first recognize that the National Security Resources Board is a very vital arm of our national security. If the functions of this Board are not effectively administered, it may be impossible for our armed forces to protect our national security. If another war should occur, it very likely would come by sudden attack, with the use of atomic weapons. In the future we will not have the time, as in the past, to prepare for our home defense. The industrial and civilian mobilization of our resources is the first step before our armed services can operate effectively. The National Security Resources Board, as at present constituted under the existing law, will perform all of the functions which have heretofore been vested in the War Production Board, the Petroleum Administration for War, the War Foods Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the War Shipping Administration. It will have complete charge of plans concerning industrial and civilian mobilization, the stock piling of strategic and critical materials, and likewise the strategic relocation of industries and other activities, which might be necessary by reason of the possibility of an atomic attack.

Never before have such tremendous responsibilities been vested by law in a single agency. The potentialities of its duties, in my judgment, make the appointment of the Chairman one of the most important that can come before the Senate for confirmation. This is particularly so because it is a one-man Board in the sense that excepting the Chairman, the members are ex officio, as they are members of the President's Cabinet and are fully occupied with their own duties, so that they could not give detailed attention to the work of the Board. The Chairman is the only active member.

Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, a man of great ability, who assisted in the preparation of the legislation to establish the Board, testified that: "The National Security Resources Board should be established at once. It should have the most competent chairman you could find who should be on the job all the time."

The responsibilities of this position are so vast and so vital to our security that we need a man of the caliber of Bernard Baruch. The competency, the breadth of vision, and the administrative capacity of the Chairman of this Board may be a powerful factor in the ability of this country to survive a future war. This position should be filled by the most competent and capable man available without regard for past political services or personal friendship.

It is because of these compelling reasons that, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have given the utmost consideration of which I am capable to the nomination of Mr. Wallgren now pending. I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that Mr. Wallgren does not possess the administrative qualifications from the standpoint of training, experience, and competency to perform the extremely important functions devolving upon him should his appointment be confirmed. I want to say that my decision has not been influenced by any

unsupported charges made against him. I do not believe Mr. Wallgren is a Communist or that he has any sympathy with communism, and I do not impugn his integrity. But the testimony before the committee convinces me that he has been careless in some of his appointments as Governor of the State of Washington. I shall discuss this further, from the committee record, when the occasion arises.

I am unfavorably impressed by the fact that, even though Mr. Wallgren had not been confirmed by the Senate, Jack Gorrie, who served as Assistant Governor of the State of Washington under Governor Wallgren, John Ballew, who served as director of the department of finance, budget, and business, and John Davis, who served for Governor Wallgren as director of the State department of unemployment security, were employed by the National Security Resources Board some weeks ago, each receiving \$50 a day and expenses, in anticipation of Mr. Wallgren's confirmation. These gentlemen, I assume, are to receive high positions in the National Security Resources Board organization.

This was significant to me, in that Governor Wallgren was defeated for reelection as Governor of Washington last November, notwithstanding the fact that President Truman swept the State in what may be termed a Democratic landslide. There is nothing dishonorable in defeat for public office, but, in this instance, it must be assumed that Mr. Wallgren's defeat in a Democratic year was occasioned by the widespread feeling throughout the State of Washington that his administration had been unsatisfactory to those who best knew him and those in his administration.

Yet immediately after they were given a vote of no confidence in their own State, it is proposed to move Governor Wallgren and three of his principal assistants to Washington at the head of a critical Government agency, with his three assistants precipitately installed there even before the confirmation of Governor Wallgren.

I have reached the definite conclusion that it is my duty as a Senator to vote against the confirmation of Governor Wallgren because of my sincere belief that he is not qualified to perform such vast responsibilities as will be placed upon him should he be confirmed as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, where, I repeat, he would be the only active member and the most powerful influence in its operations and important decisions.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POSITION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

By statute: The National Security Act of 1947 provides:

"It shall be the function of the Board to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization, including—

"(1) policies concerning industrial and civilian mobilization in order to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the event of war;

"(2) programs for the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy in time of war, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

"(3) policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products;

"(4) the relationship between potential supplies of, and potential requirements for,

manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war;

"(5) policies for establishing adequate reserve of strategic and critical material, and for the conservation of these reserves."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Virginia brought up the question of the right of the Senate to confirm an appointment made by the President. I certainly agree that confirmation is absolutely essential upon an important position such as the one that was before the Committee on Armed Services. But I am wondering whether the able Senator from Virginia would not favor a rule coming from the Committee on Rules and Administration which would permit the Senate to vote upon an appointment of this kind, even though there might be an adverse report by the committee.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator the rules already permit it. All the Senator from Illinois, as the majority leader of the Senate, had to do in this case was to move to discharge the committee, and, had he obtained the votes of a simple majority of the Senators present, the nomination would then have come before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I understand, I may say to my good friend from Virginia, that that is the rule. But the Senator from Virginia well knows that unless the chairman of a committee is almost willing to go on the floor of the Senate himself and say, "I am willing, and will vote to discharge my own committee," it is almost impossible to discharge a committee under those circumstances. I am sure the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] never would have agreed to vote to discharge his own committee. As the Senator well knows, it is a very delicate and dangerous thing to discharge a committee from the consideration of any kind of bill or of an appointment by the President. I doubt that there is a member of the Armed Services Committee who would have voted to discharge the committee from the consideration of the appointment, after the position of the committee was disclosed by a vote of 7 to 6.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator that the distinguished chairman of the committee voted for the confirmation of Governor Wallgren.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that.

Mr. BYRD. On the floor of the Senate, had he cared to do so, he would have had a perfect right to vote to discharge the committee and bring the nomination before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and the Senator from Maryland would have had a right, of course, to move to discharge his own committee.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Maryland would not have had to make the motion necessarily.

Mr. LUCAS. No; any Senator could have made the motion.

Mr. BYRD. Any Senator could make it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator well knows that the privilege of a committee to lay a matter on the table applies not only to

a nomination but to any bill. Any matter that comes before the committee can be laid on the table by a majority of the membership of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thoroughly understand that. Let me say to my distinguished and able colleague from Virginia that the only point I raise—and I think it is a very important one—is that there was an appointment made by the President of the United States. We all know—it has been argued times without number on the floor of the Senate—that once an appointment is made by the President of the United States, it carries within itself great weight in assuring that the individual who is so appointed possesses the necessary qualifications to fill the position for which he is nominated. We have here a situation in which one individual Senator overrides the President of the United States, and the Senate of the United States has no opportunity whatever to pass upon the nomination, other than through the discharge of the committee. The Senator from Virginia well knows that when the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] moved to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the consideration of a resolution to amend the cloture rule, the Democrats met in caucus and discussed the subject; they discussed thoroughly the delicacy and seriousness of the question involved in the discharge of the committee. We agreed that the orderly business procedure of the Senate was involved in the motion. Every Democrat in the caucus voted not to discharge the committee, because of the importance of the principle involved in taking away from a committee something which had been assigned to it.

Mr. BYRD. But, under those peculiar circumstances, one Democrat voting against the confirmation, it would have been entirely proper for any member of the committee to have submitted a motion to discharge the committee from consideration, and it could have been argued on the basis that here was one Democrat who voted with the Republicans not to confirm the nomination. It would seem to me that if the President thought it was so vitally important to bring the matter before the Senate, the Senator should have made such a motion.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct, but I still make the point that with respect to an appointment so important as is the one we are discussing, no committee should have a right to refuse to bring the nomination before the Senate. In other words, if the committee voted adversely on the appointment, the matter should come to the floor of the Senate. That was done in the case of the Honorable Raymond McKeough, a citizen from my State, who was appointed a few years ago to fill a position on the Maritime Commission. The committee voted 10 to 8 not to report the nomination favorably. But the committee did not table the nomination. It said, "Even though the committee does not favor the nomination of Raymond McKeough, we shall report it adversely, take it to the floor, and let the Senators themselves debate it and make the decision." That

was done, and Raymond McKeough's nomination was confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. In this instance why did not the Senator from Illinois, as majority leader, make the motion to discharge?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that the majority leader did not make the motion for the simple reason that he was satisfied, from his slight investigation, that the Committee on Armed Services would not have stood with the majority leader in a motion to discharge the committee. If the Armed Services Committee would not stand with the majority leader in a motion to discharge the committee from consideration of the question, he would not have had much of a chance to get it to the floor.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has said that the nomination was tabled by reason of the vote of one Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia assumes full responsibility for casting the deciding vote. He does not evade any responsibility whatever.

Mr. LUCAS. It could have been any one of seven Senators.

Mr. BYRD. Let me finish my statement, please. If the Senator from Virginia acted in an arbitrary manner or in a manner which showed bias or political prejudice, why should not the committee have been discharged and the question brought to the floor of the Senate? If the other Democratic members of the committee would not vote to discharge the committee, I think that is evidence that the committee thought the Senator from Virginia had not assumed a biased or partisan attitude.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator this question: In all the Senator's experience, does he recall any other important appointment of this kind being tabled in the committee?

Mr. BYRD. In all the time I have been in the Senate I have never seen such a poor witness, such an incompetent witness, and one who was in such complete ignorance of his duties in the position for which he was nominated, as was the gentleman in question. Other members of the committee who voted in favor of the distinguished former Governor of Washington have told me the same thing. The testimony lasted a week, and the subject was gone into very fully.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that does not answer my question. I am not at this particular time arguing the merits or the demerits of the former Governor of Washington, Mon Wallgren. I am inquiring with reference to a very vital, fundamental, and basic principle involving an appointment made by the President of the United States, irrespective of the qualifications of the individual. It is the first time, within my knowledge—and I cannot find a similar case in the records which I have searched—that a committee has ever tabled an important nomination to such a high position in the executive branch of the Government. In other words, the committee would not permit it to come before the Senate on an adverse report and take the chance of the Senate confirming the nomination. It was tabled, and that was the end of it.

Mr. BYRD. If the matter was so vitally important, the Senate of the United States has complete control of all legislation and of all nominations sent to the Senate, and the committee could have been discharged. The Senator from Illinois knows of many important bills which have been laid on the table—bills as important as are nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. BYRD. I have not searched the records, but I am sure quite a number of nominations have been laid on the table. I know of some which have been kept by the committee for many months.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois does not agree with the Senator from Virginia that an inanimate bill is in the same category as an appointment of a human being to an important executive position.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me to be very strange that the majority leader has remained silent all this time. He evidently thought he would be defeated, or he would have made the effort.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Virginia undoubtedly knew he would be defeated, or the motion to table would never have been made.

Mr. BYRD. I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Why was the motion to table made?

Mr. BYRD. I did not make the motion to table, but I shall tell the Senator why I voted for it. I regard this appointment as one of the most important sent to the United States Senate in a long time, and I regard former Governor Wallgren as being less competent for the position than any man ever nominated to a position of this kind. I thought it my duty as a Senator, in a matter vitally affecting the security of the country, affecting the lives of our boys if there should be another war, to use every parliamentary procedure I could to defeat the nomination. I proceeded strictly in accordance with the rules. I felt so keenly on the subject that I exercised that right.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator felt keenly about it, and I am not objecting to that. But I submit that when an individual is nominated by the President of the United States for a position that has Cabinet standing there is a presumption that the person nominated has the necessary qualifications to fulfill the position, and it seems to me the Senate of the United States ought to have the right to vote upon it.

Mr. President, I shall soon offer a rule to prohibit a repetition of this type of parliamentary procedure. I am prepared to go before the Committee on Rules and Administration in an endeavor to make it absolutely necessary for the committee to report a nomination, regardless of whether it is good or bad, to the floor of the Senate and let it be argued out by the Members, instead of having a committee of 13 make a decision upon an appointment of this kind. I believe such a rule will be adopted by the Senate. I do not believe the Senate of the United States will permit any committee, from here on, to bottle up a Cabinet appointment, or an appoint-

ment of equal type and dignity, and not permit the Members of the Senate themselves to decide whether the President of the United States is right or wrong.

The Senator from Virginia says this man is not qualified. The President of the United States thought he was qualified, and a number of Senators believe he is qualified. I seriously doubt that there is a member of the Armed Services Committee who voted against Mon Wallgren who does not think he himself is well qualified to fill the position. I doubt that there is a Senator in the United States Senate today who does not feel he is qualified to fill the position. If any Senator now on the floor believes that he is devoid of the necessary qualifications to fill the position, I should like to have him stand and let his constituents know that he is not capable of filling the position.

Mr. BYRD. If our constituents think we are not qualified as Senators, we are not sent back. That is not the case with someone who is nominated by the President to fill a position of vital consequence, when the lives of Americans may be at stake.

Mr. LUCAS. He was a Senator and he was a Governor, and I do not believe there is presently a Member of the United States Senate, if the President should appoint him today, who would not be confirmed, regardless of who he is.

Mr. BYRD. I stand and say Governor Wallgren is not qualified.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Virginia feel he is qualified to serve in that important post?

Mr. BYRD. I do not aspire to any office except that of Senator. My constituents appear to believe me to be qualified, because I have been elected in four elections, and I owe my allegiance to my constituents in Virginia.

I do not think a confirmation by the Senate is a perfunctory thing. I think that when the Constitution says that certain appointments shall be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate it means something. It does not mean that we should approve blindly every nomination the President submits.

Mr. LUCAS. Why did we not have the opportunity to give advice and consent?

Mr. BYRD. Because under the rules of the Senate the Senator did not avail himself of the opportunity to move to discharge the committee. The Senator from Illinois was as much to blame as anyone for this matter not coming before the Senate, because he made no effort, he did not offer a motion, never said a word, never appeared before the committee asking that Mr. Wallgren's nomination be reported to the Senate, never mentioned the matter, so far as I know, in a public way, until now.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The distinguished Senator from Virginia was chairman of the Committee on Rules before the Reorganization Act was passed, and I was a member of the committee. He was a great chairman, he is a courageous Senator, and I have a great affection for him, but I know that anyone who had desired

to have the Rules Committee discharged from the consideration of a matter at that particular time never would have gotten the vote of the Senator from Illinois. If anyone wanted to discharge the Committee on Finance, headed by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], he could not get the majority leader's vote.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator never made an attempt.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows how little good it would have done.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator was leading in such a great cause, he could have made a motion to discharge the committee and bring the nomination before the Senate for discussion, but he knew he would be defeated, and that is why he did not do it.

Mr. LUCAS. No; the Senator from Virginia knew he would be defeated, and that is why the motion to table the nomination was made.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] made the motion to lay the nomination on the table. That is not the reason. I exercised the privilege I had as a Senator, under the parliamentary procedure of the Senate. I have no apologies to make to the Senator from Illinois, to the President, or to anyone else, for doing what I did.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3997) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Downey	Lucas	Taft
Eaton	McCarran	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McMahon	Tobey
Graham	Martin	Watkins
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Hendrickson	Millikin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Withers
Hill	Murray	
Hoey		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments may be voted upon separately. I ask for a separate vote on my amendment lettered "A" first. And on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to have a separate vote on his two amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that the Senator from North Dakota previ-

ously asked and obtained unanimous consent to have the two amendments voted on together. No objection was interposed. I thought it would be in the economy of time to have the two amendments voted on together. I have no objection to a separate vote being taken on each of the Senator's amendments, but I do not understand why the Senator desires it at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am inclined to think that if the two amendments are voted on separately I can succeed in having one adopted, even though the other is defeated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall not object to the Senator's request, but I hope the Senate will not agree to either amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will vote separately on the two amendments offered by the Senator from North Dakota. The first amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,063,000" and insert "\$7,063,000."

Mr. LANGER. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "\$150,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$350,000,000."

Mr. LANGER. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has asked for the yeas and nays on his amendment lettered "C."

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "B," and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, between lines 20 and 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

Extension of telephone service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make such studies, surveys, and investigations as may be necessary to enable him to ascertain and develop methods of utilizing Rural Electrification Administration lines for the purpose of extending telephone facilities to farmers and persons living in rural areas who are not adequately supplied with telephone service, \$50,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my purpose in offering the amendment is to find out whether we can bring telephone service to farmers living in rural areas where there are no telephone lines of any kind or description; whether we can utilize the REA lines for the purpose of bringing telephones into these farm homes. I might add that at the present time an

experiment along this line is being conducted in Macon, Mo. I understand there is not sufficient money available to enable those who are conducting the experiment to complete it. Therefore I hope the Senate will vote to adopt my amendment and provide \$50,000 for such purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, now that we have the Rural Electrification Administration in operation, there is nothing more important than some means of bringing telephone service or other means of communication to the farmers of the country. A number of bills dealing with the subject have been introduced. As I recall, the distinguished Senator who now graces the Chair as Presiding Officer, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], introduced a bill providing for rural telephone service; the distinguished Senator from North Dakota introduced a bill dealing with the same subject, and Representative POAGE, of Texas, has introduced a bill in the House, which has been reported to the floor of the House. Being charged with responsibility for this legislation I am enjoined by the rules to make a point of order against legislation on an appropriation bill. This is legislation, and I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is out of order.

Mr. LANGER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to be recognized?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I concede the point of order is well taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment which was not disposed of yesterday.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$8,975,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does this represent the increased appropriation requested for flood control?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. This amendment was passed over yesterday. I have since received a copy of the report to which reference was made yesterday, and I understand that earlier in the afternoon a copy of the report was furnished to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia to say that he had received a copy of the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps that is the reason why my office is now trying to reach me. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia has received a copy of the report, I have no objection to the consideration of the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised that a copy of the report has been on the desk of the Senator from Nebraska since about 1 o'clock today.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for notifying me that a copy of the report is on my desk. I have not been in the Chamber. I have been in attendance at an Appropriations Subcommittee hearing in connection with the independent-offices bill. I have just returned to the floor.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Georgia a question in this connection. Is this the amendment which provides some money to employ an additional staff member to help get out the agricultural flood-control reports?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The amendment which was passed over provides \$10,000,000 for field work in the various watersheds in the country. The amendment providing a smaller amount for a man in the office of the Secretary was agreed to yesterday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That item is not in the House language; is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not. It was added by the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not ask that that amendment be reconsidered, but I ask the able Senator from Georgia, who is in charge of the bill, to look into that question before going to conference. In my judgment, there is some doubt about its being needed, in the first place; and in the second place, the reports have not yet been made available, unless the report which the Senator mentioned a few minutes ago is such a report.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been widespread complaint that reports have not been made available. I have undertaken to communicate with the office of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the delay. Only today, after the question was raised by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the report of the survey in the Missouri River Basin has been furnished to me, and I am advised that all the reports which have been concluded will be in the mail within the next day or two, and will be furnished to all Senators who are interested in the various watersheds.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the reports have been concluded, why is an additional man needed to try to get them out?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the extra man in the office of the Secretary was not to handle the reports. He was to be an engineer, who was to undertake to coordinate the work done by field parties of the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am willing to follow the judgment of the able Senator from Georgia, but the subject has been called to my attention. I am sure that the Senator from Georgia will look into it further before the bill goes to conference, or while it is in conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that our hearings are largely ex parte. The House omitted this particular item. I assume that the House had what it considered to be a sound reason for doing so. Two or three witnesses appeared before our committee to request that the item be restored; and, on the basis of the case made before us, I thought it was worthy of consideration, and I supported its restoration. I assure the Senator that I will meet the House conferees with an open mind, and will be glad to hear any reasons they may have for omitting that provision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The item may be fully justified, but I have received some

complaints about it. I merely wished to call it to the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill so that he might look into the question further before going to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Georgia if he would not hold up this committee amendment until today, so that we might have another opportunity to see whether or not the Secretary would submit the report of the survey made of the Missouri Basin States, which survey was authorized by the last Congress. The Senator from Georgia agreed to do so. A moment ago I stated that I had no objection to the present consideration of the committee amendment. Of course, it has nothing to do with the report which I wanted.

I have just taken this question up with my office, and I have been informed that a report has been left there. It is marked "confidential." Inasmuch as it is confidential, I do not propose to comment on it at this time. However, I am informed by my secretary that a hurried examination reveals that it is not the report for which we asked. However, it is a report. I shall reserve my comments about it until later. I shall not object to the consideration of this amendment now, but I feel that this is one time when the head of an agency of Government has thwarted the will of Congress. I expect to make some remarks on the subject after the report has been released and is no longer confidential, to show what has been done to thwart the interests of Senators from the Missouri River Basin who might have something to say about flood-control appropriations in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 43, line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 51, line 16, was agreed to. My purpose in moving to reconsider the vote is to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment heretofore agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 51, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert "\$87,500,000."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Senator state the purpose which he has in mind?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to be agreeable, but I do not want to reconsider an item merely for the purpose of reconsidering it. I think some statement should be made as to what the Senator has in mind before we accede to the motion.

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to state my purpose. I should like to offer an amendment, if I am able to obtain re-

consideration of this amendment, to increase the amount for the school-lunch program from \$87,500,000 to \$100,000,000.

Yesterday the Senator from Georgia stated that in his opinion this program for an orderly increase could well stand as much as \$115,000,000. I should like to see the item larger than that. I am proposing in my amendment to split the difference with the Senator from Georgia, as between what he thinks this program could use and the amount which the committee has authorized.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator wishes to offer an amendment, we can have a vote on it one way or the other. If the Senate wishes to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, the issue can be drawn on the amendment. If the Senate does not wish to reconsider the amendment, the Senator's amendment will stand where it is. I am opposed to the Senator's amendment, for reasons which I shall be happy to state. We might avoid the necessity of two votes by having the vote come on the motion to reconsider. Senators understand the issue involved. I think perhaps that would save us a little time.

The Senator is dealing with something that has always been dear to my heart. I have made many statements favorable to the school-lunch program. However, I do not believe that I stated that this was not an orderly increase in the program. The committee has increased the amount to \$87,500,000. That is a very substantial increase, and is the largest amount ever allowed by any committee of either body for the school-lunch program.

Mr. LONG. I ask the Senator from Georgia to refer to page 6335 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday. The Senator from Georgia was asked the following question:

Does he believe that the appropriation recommended is large enough to meet the school-lunch needs of the country?

To which the Senator from Georgia answered:

Mr. President, since the Senator puts the question in that way, an honest answer, of course, would have to be "No." It does not meet all the needs of the school-lunch program. However, it is the largest amount that has ever been recommended by either body of the Congress for the school-lunch program, and I think it will allow for a healthy expansion and development of that program. There is no doubt that as much as \$115,000,000 could be expended on the school-lunch program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. More than that could be expended.

I am not sure, but I thought I stated in the course of that discussion or colloquy that the evidence disclosed that many persons interested in schools thought \$115,000,000 could be expended. I never charge the reporters with an error, but I thought I stated that the evidence before the committee was that all the representatives of the parent-teacher organizations and the representatives of the schools had suggested that \$115,000,000 could be expended.

Perhaps the Senator from Florida may recall my remarks, because his statement elicited them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator from Louisiana, is it not to be hoped that the able Senator from Georgia, in view of the fact that the committee amendments were adopted in a rather short time yesterday afternoon, and that notice was given—although I gave it for myself, yet I am one of the Senators who joins the Senator from Louisiana in respect to the amendment he desires to present—

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that at the time I suggested that that be done.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I was going to suggest that it seems to me that it is to be hoped that the Senator from Georgia will permit the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was adopted, so that we may present this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the question of whether the Senate should reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted is a rather important and material one. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was adopted yesterday be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 51, in line 16, was adopted be reconsidered? The Chair hears no objection; the vote by which the amendment was adopted is reconsidered, and the amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, and I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 51, in line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$87,500,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this amendment to the committee amendment is offered by me, in behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself.

In speaking in support of the amendment to the committee amendment, I wish to say that in my State we very much appreciate the aid of the Federal school-lunch program. However, the pending amendment to the committee amendment probably would do my State less good than it would do almost any other State in the Nation, because in my opinion my State leads the Nation in its school-lunch program. The Federal Government is spending in my State approximately \$1,500,000 of the \$75,000,000 authorized for this purpose by the Eightieth Congress. That is about \$1 for every \$5 which we in Louisiana spend on school lunches. The amount being spent by the Federal Government on school lunches in my State is a mere

drop in the bucket, as compared to the amount of money which my State is spending for that purpose. Of course, we can very well use the assistance proposed under this program.

I know that in the next year and in the years ahead we must find some way to try to dispose of our enormous agricultural surpluses. One of the strongest reasons why some Senators voted for the European recovery program was the amount of agricultural commodities which it is anticipated will be purchased in this country under that program. Certainly, Mr. President, if we can afford to spend billions of dollars in sending food to Europe, we can afford to spend a few million dollars additional to feed our own school children. If we have to economize, I would rather economize by making reductions in the program for European aid in the amount of ten times the amount carried by the amendment we are now considering, rather than by making reductions at the expense of our own school children.

I have received from the school authorities in my own State communications to the effect that since the school-lunch program has been commenced in Louisiana, great improvements in the health of our school children have been observed. That is the beneficial work the Federal Government is aiding with its meager assistance of \$1,500,000 to Louisiana under the school-lunch program. If my amendment to the committee amendment is adopted, the result will be a slight increase in the amount of Federal assistance for the school-lunch program in Louisiana—increasing the aid for Louisiana to \$1,800,000, which will be a mere drop in the bucket, but a good drop in a good bucket.

That being the case, I believe we should help in this way to improve the school-lunch program.

The committee amendment would do such a fragmentary job in supplying the need that it would result in very little help to the program. If I correctly interpret the School-Lunch Act and what its purpose seems to be, it was intended as a pump-priming action, with the result that eventually the States themselves would take over the program and improve it. Judging from the slow rate at which the program is being developed, it will be many years before the other States of the United States will have an adequate school-lunch program. My State can very well use the small increase in funds which it would obtain from the Federal Government under the school-lunch program.

It may be said that some Members of Congress cannot be interested in providing lunches for school children, but can be interested in a program which will help dispose of farm commodities. If that be the case, let us consider the program on the basis of what it will do to help dispose of farm commodities, rather than to help school children. In any case, I say we should increase by \$12,500,000 the appropriation to provide lunches for school children.

At the rate at which we are now proceeding in connection with this program, I do not believe the Nation will

ever have an adequate school-lunch program. I do not believe we shall be properly encouraging it to the extent that we should, even if my amendment to the committee amendment is adopted; but, in any event, by adopting my amendment to the committee amendment we shall at least be making a move in the right direction; in the direction of feeding hungry school children. If that step is taken, I am sure the good results which have been obtained in my State will be obtained in other States, if there is proper interest and proper Federal encouragement of the school-lunch program.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the able Senator from Louisiana in offering this amendment to the committee amendment. The proposal is to increase by \$12,500,000 the amount carried by the committee amendment, which in turn represents a \$12,500,000 increase in the amount allowed for this purpose by the House of Representatives.

So if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself is adopted to the committee amendment, the result will be to add only an additional \$25,000,000 to the amount allowed for this purpose by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, we live in a practical world, and the Congress is a practical Congress. As this bill was passed by the House of Representatives, \$75,000,000 was allowed for the program we are now discussing. The Senate committee has reported an amendment which would increase that amount to \$87,500,000, which is an increase of \$12,500,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. I doubt whether the conferees on the part of the Senate would be able to succeed in retaining the entire \$12,500,000, in the conference with the House of Representatives. Certainly no one would contend that either \$87,500,000 or \$100,000,000 or even \$150,000,000, as my distinguished colleague and I have sought to have provided by means of a bill we have introduced, would meet the needs of the school children. So we are not likely to approach anywhere near the full public need if we appropriate \$100,000,000 for this purpose, as will be done if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment is adopted by the Senate and remains in the law as finally enacted.

Mr. President, the \$75,000,000 allowed for this program by the House of Representatives is grossly inadequate. The House of Representatives is to be commended for taking the school-lunch appropriation out of the general fund of the Treasury and not out of section 32 funds, which were directly designed and intended by the Congress to be used by the Government to acquire surplus agricultural commodities which the farmers desired to dispose of. So the House of Representatives is to be commended for making this particular appropriation payable directly out of the Public Treasury, as in the case of other appropriations. Certainly that

should be done. Then the section 32 funds, which were intended to be used to help the farmers dispose of surplus agricultural commodities, which otherwise would be sold in glutted markets, will be available for the purpose for which they were originally intended.

Mr. President, in the fiscal year 1948, only 21.5 percent of the schools of the United States participated in the school-lunch program. In other words, only approximately one-fifth of the schools of the United States were able to participate in the school-lunch program; the remainder were unable to participate in it, because of a lack of adequate and necessary funds. The result has been that only 21.1 percent of the 26,124,141 school children in the United States were able to participate in the school-lunch program in 1948. So what do we see? At the present time, with the \$75,000,000 appropriation, which was the amount last year, only one-fifth of the schools and a fifth of the children of the country are able to participate in the school-lunch program.

Is the Senate satisfied with that, to feed one child out of five, to aid one school out of five? Is that enough? Is it extravagant, prodigal, and wasteful to attempt more than that, even a little more? I am sure we do not think it is. In Florida, fortunately, we were able to get the figures a little higher by a larger State contribution.

An estimated 972,000,000 meals were served in 1948, as compared with 911,000,000 in 1949. About 55 percent were nutritious meals, which are complete, furnishing the equivalent of about one-third of a day's nutritive requirements for children.

But, Mr. President, while the States and the local communities were spending \$260,000,000, the Federal Government spent only \$70,000,000 in trying to provide one nutritious meal a day for the children of the country. Furthermore, Mr. President, only 12 percent of the school children who participate receive free meals, or receive meals at less than cost. Only 12 percent of the children, a little more than one-eighth of the children, receive free meals, or meals at less than cost.

Here is something I have discovered in my State by visiting some of the public schools. I am told that in many cases, where there is more than one child in the family, the children have to get the lunches alternately, or every third day, because the family is unable to pay the required 23 cents a meal for each child every day.

At the present time, State appropriations are inadequate. Local public authorities do not have the funds. In order to supplement the Federal appropriation, they have to rely upon gifts by civic clubs and private citizens, to make it possible for children who cannot pay the real cost to get at least one nutritious meal a day.

So there is a need for these funds. I may point out one other fact. These funds have not increased in the past two fiscal years. The appropriation was \$75,000,000 last year, which is the same amount the House provided this year. The Senate bill appropriates \$87,500,000,

representing only a small increase over last year. Yet the average cost per meal rose 47.5 percent between 1943 and 1949. In 1946 it was 15 cents a meal; in 1947, 20 cents, and in 1948, 25 cents. So the increase in the cost of a meal tends to offset the increase in the contribution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator speaks of the increased cost of the meal. That relates back to what was required for school lunches. Can the Senator refer me to a time when we ever had a school-lunch program in this country that was in any way adequate?

Mr. PEPPER. Never. On the contrary, I may read from page 438 of the hearings in the House of Representatives. This relates to the volume of funds required to meet the demands for the school-lunch program:

Mr. STIGLER. Is your appropriation adequate to meet the demand of the program from the various States?

Mr. TRAINER—

He was representing School Lunch Program Division of the Department of Agriculture—

According to the reactions of the State agencies and their feeling about it and their representations to us, frankly, it is not adequate.

Mr. STIGLER. How much would it take to meet the present demand made upon you?

Mr. TRAINER. And permit normal expansion within the States?

Mr. STIGLER. Yes.

Mr. TRAINER. I would say today it would take within the neighborhood of \$150,000,000.

And all we are asking in the Senate is \$100,000,000, which will have to run the gamut of further conference with the House of Representatives.

Just one other fact. Scientific studies show, first, that children all over the country lack a proper daily diet. In Florida a survey of rural-school children revealed that less than 10 percent receive proper nutrition. In this appropriation we are dealing with the future strength of America. We are talking about the ability of the citizenship of tomorrow to work and to fight for America, and for what she stands. I am saying we are voting this afternoon on the amount of strength that goes into the bones of the school children of America. That is what we are voting here this afternoon, not for a few dollars. We are voting on the strength of the constitution and the stamina of the citizenship of America tomorrow.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know that during the last war the draft boards found that 30 percent of the young men they examined could not physically qualify for the service, and that, among colored men, it ran as high as 50 percent of the young colored men they examined, who could not physically qualify? Does not the Senator realize that malnutrition had something to do with that?

Mr. PEPPER. Undoubtedly so; undoubtedly so.

The following are some of the more important deficiencies: Milk 97 percent, eggs 90 percent, vegetables 65 percent, citrus 64 percent—even in Florida, fats 77 percent. Another study of the effects of the school-lunch program in Florida shows that pupils with gross symptoms of malnutrition were given special vitamin and iron concentrates and a good lunch. In another school, anemic children were given iron and liver concentrate plus a good lunch. In both instances, the children showed excellent improvement in physical measurements, developmental age, general health, and school attendance, and marked decreases in ailments.

Mr. President, it would not be too much to say that the money we spend in bettering the diet of the children of America will be saved in hospital and doctor's bills. It is not too much to say that it is a fine investment in good citizenship. Healthiness and normality tend to make for the sort of citizenship that saves expenditures upon crime and juvenile delinquency in America.

It should be noted that in Minnesota, North Carolina, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan, Virginia, and New Mexico, surveys showed similar results. The National School Lunch Act has been most beneficial for our school children, even though they get only one decent meal a day.

Senators, of course, do not need to be advised upon this matter. I am only pleading for economy. I am pleading to prevent waste. I am pleading for the wise expenditure of our treasures. I am pleading for something far more valuable and important and productive than the dollars we spend. I am pleading not only for children but for a stronger and greater and a more productive America.

I need not remind this assemblage of sympathetic Senators of the admonitions concerning the dignity and the worth of those with whom we deal, when I quote what the Master himself said to those who would be inconsiderate of the children:

Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

It might be added, of such is the future of the earth, as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the increase proposed by the amendment is \$12,500,000. It will be noted that there are in the United States approximately 26,000,000 children. That means that we shall be voting for only approximately 50 cents more a child a year. Under the present bill there is \$87,500,000 provided. If we divide the 26,000,000 children into that amount we have only \$3.25 a child. Think of that measly amount. If we add 50 cents more to it, it will amount to \$3.75. Is not that a small amount?

I invite the Senate's attention to the fact that only a few days ago we gave to the people of other lands \$5,500,000,000. I venture to say that, of that sum, many times the amount which is here involved will be given to the children of other lands. Shall we treat our children any differently from the way we would treat the children of other nations?

As I see it, Mr. President, this amendment will encourage the schools throughout the land to enter the school-lunch program. There are certain foods which are in surplus. I remember when there was a surplus of Irish potatoes which could be purchased very cheaply. When they were purchased, it helped the farmers. There were some places in which there were so many potatoes that they were being thrown into the gutter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is not what the Senator and I are proposing, in effect, to take those potatoes and feed them to children instead of throwing them away or feeding them to the hogs? Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. Food is bought up throughout the Nation where there is an overproduction or an oversupply, and, in many instances, when it would otherwise go to waste, it is bought and used for the school children.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. What percentage of the 26,000,000 children mentioned are underprivileged or indigent or cannot afford to buy their school lunches?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In some States the number is far greater than in others. I do not know the exact percentage throughout the United States. I do know, however, that in a great many sections of the Nation it is not possible for some of the children to purchase their lunches.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the Senator think it would be more equitable to limit the school-lunch program to the underprivileged children, rather than to consider the over-all picture and include those who can afford to pay, and give them free lunches?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Personally, I do not. We are only encouraging the program of the States. It helps out in that way. The schools cannot feed a child a week for \$3.25.

Mr. FREAR. Do I correctly understand that the underprivileged school children do pay something for their school lunches?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In some places they do and in some places they do not. That is up to the particular school involved. The Federal Government does not regulate that, as I understand.

Mr. FREAR. Who pays the difference? If a school child cannot afford to pay anything, and the Government contributes only a portion of the cost, who pays the difference?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In some places there are different kinds of systems. Under some systems money is raised by various and sundry means in order to have a surplus fund. The Federal appropriation helps to buy the food. No school I know of makes one red penny. The meals are prepared at the schools and are given to the children at cost.

Mr. FREAR. I am in favor of indigent children having free lunches, and I encourage it. But the question I ask is, Why should the Federal Government give a part of the cost of a free lunch to those students who can afford to pay for it? Would it not be better to allot the money entirely to the indigent children instead of giving it to those who can afford to pay a part of the cost?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would answer the Senator's question by saying that would be true if there were a sufficient number of students in each school to justify that end. But the great difficulty is that in each school it will be found there are very few who cannot afford to pay something and we cannot always draw the line without making some child feel embarrassed.

Mr. FREAR. I can appreciate that there might be some embarrassment with respect to some children accepting a free lunch, but I think, for the sake of the health of all the children, it would be better for the underprivileged children to have greater amounts contributed to them, and withhold the money from those who can afford to pay. Any school which has a sufficient number of children to put on a lunch program has underprivileged children as well as those who can pay a hundred percent for their lunches. There would be no distinction other than that the underprivileged would not pay, but those who could pay would pay in proportion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Referring to page 425 of the House report, the Federal Government's appropriation was \$70,000,000. That was 26.9 percent of the total cost of the meals furnished. Sources within the States contributed \$138,232,000, or 53.2 percent of the total cost. That is broken down as follows:

State and local governmental appropriations, \$29,052,000, or 11.2 percent.

Other local contributions, such as contributions by civic clubs and generously disposed persons, 8.7 percent of the total cost.

Total State contributions, \$190,008,000, or 73.1 percent of the total cost.

My advice is that only 12 percent of the children received meals at less than cost, or free, so that those children who were considered by the local people, who knew the situation, to be unable to pay the full cost or anything toward the cost of the meals, were given their meals at what it was thought they could pay, or at no cost at all. So that what the Senator proposes, as I understand, is already being carried out. Those who can pay are paying the full cost of the meals, and those who cannot pay the full cost are given their meals free or are paying what they are able to afford.

Mr. FREAR. May I ask the Senator, is that true all over the country, or is it true by communities or States?

Mr. PEPPER. I dare say there is some variation in the program, because, as the Senator knows, the Federal Government puts up only 26.9 percent of the total appropriation. Most of it is local, so there is undoubtedly a variation.

Mr. FREAR. May I ask if in adding his figures the Senator got up to 100 percent?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I got up to 100 percent of the total \$260,000,000. The total includes contributions by children, by the local communities and the States, and by the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is correct. He will find that throughout the United States there are different patterns and different systems in different schools.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that the school-lunch program is a good thing even if the children have to pay the price of the meal? If there is a school-lunch program, the children who go to school eat a balanced diet. Otherwise, if there is no school-lunch program, which is the case in an enormous number of schools, the family gives the little child the money to buy a lunch, and sometimes it goes into Crackerjack, popcorn, or peanuts, and the child never does have the good, nutritious food it should eat, such as he would have if there were a good, well-organized school-lunch program.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that what the Senator from Louisiana has said is true. Even though we were not caring for those who were not able to pay, if we would only encourage the system and care for them along with the others, we would find that the system itself was worth the money the Federal Government is paying out, to encourage a school-lunch program within the schools.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I thought I made myself clear that I am in favor of the school-lunch program—100 percent in favor of it. But I am in favor of the underprivileged receiving more than those who can afford to pay, not putting them all on a par, whether it is under a State contribution, a Federal contribution, or other contribution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator will find that if his State wants to go into a State program, the Federal program would not keep it from doing so. It is left to the States to say what kind of a program they want to enter into. I am a great believer in leaving it to the States to run their own affairs.

Mr. FREAR. I agree with what the Senator has just said. I believe that there are some underprivileged children in Delaware, but I do not think our percentage is as high as it is in some of the other States, so when I am speaking of the underprivileged children, I am speaking perhaps for States which have a greater percentage of underprivileged children than does my own State.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I have ever felt cast out of character, it is this afternoon. I am occupying the very unusual position of opposing increases in the appropriations for the rural electrification program and the school-lunch program. It so happened that for a number of years I undertook to protect and nurture both those programs, par-

ticularly the school-lunch program. It originated in my committee. Year after year the bill would come from the other body without any provision for the school-lunch program, and we would be compelled to resort to various devices, such as finding some bit of legislation in the bill to which we could tie it without the necessity of obtaining a two-thirds vote.

I had something to do with the introduction and passage of the permanent school-lunch legislation. I think it has been a program of tremendous benefit to the Nation, and I favor its expansion as rapidly as is possible. However, Mr. President, I do endeavor to be reasonable about these matters. One would think from some of the remarks which have been made here this afternoon that the committee had been very penurious in its approach to the school-lunch program. It so happens that the largest item of increase the committee made over and above the budget was the committee amendment to the school-lunch program. We exceeded the budget by the sum of \$12,500,000, and over half of the Senate increase to the totals of the bill is found in the amendment for the school-lunch program. The amount that is carried in the bill as it is presented to the Senate is greater than any appropriation that has ever been approved by a committee of any branch of the Congress for a school-lunch program.

There are other increases which are not immediately evident which will accrue from the way the bill is written. In the first place, it is common knowledge that food prices are coming down. Therefore the funds made available by the committee will purchase approximately, considering the increase, 33 1/3 percent more food for the coming fiscal year than the \$75,000,000 appropriation for last year would have purchased.

Furthermore, in our desperate effort to save this program—and we did have a very difficult time maintaining any school-lunch program in 1947—we were compelled to resort to the device of going into section 32 funds to get the money to carry on the program. We are not resorting to section 32 funds this year, and it is made a direct appropriation. That leaves available the sum of \$125,000,000 from customs receipts for the purposes of section 32.

Witnesses appeared before the committee who advocated, with logic and merit, an additional appropriation to section 32 funds because some agricultural commodities are going to be confronted with great difficulties next year. That is particularly true of the products of horticulture. There are also rumblings of difficulty being encountered in the case of some of the commodities about which people complained so much during the war years. Prices of butter and milk and other commodities are declining very rapidly, and it will probably be necessary to use some of the \$125,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing these foods.

Who will have a prior call on these foods when they are purchased under section 32 funds? It will be the school-lunch program. It will probably get grapefruit juice and other fruit juices

from the State of Florida. It will get apples and figs and prunes from the great Pacific coast. It will get other foods from other sections. During the past year when the Department of Agriculture had its unfortunate experience with potatoes, enormous quantities of potatoes have been diverted to the use of the school-lunch program. So for the coming year it is in infinitely better shape than it has even been before.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. What good is it going to do the schools all over the country if they are given whole boxcar loads of perishable food items when they have no kitchen facilities and no storage facilities to employ in preparing or preserving the foods, storing them until they can get around to using them? In my State we appropriate about four times as much as the Federal Government is giving us to do the job. We found we had to turn down the surplus commodities because we had no place to put them, and we did not have money to arrange for warehousing.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's State should make arrangements for warehouses, as any other State should. I do not believe in the Federal Government going into the warehouse business to store food, although I have supported every other phase of the lunch program. If the Senator is going to propose an amendment to have the Federal Government build a warehouse at each school house, I cannot support any such venture.

Mr. LONG. How does the Senator feel about refrigerators, or adequate stoves?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be very desirable. When we passed the legislation providing for the permanent school-lunch program we wrote in title II, a provision which allowed the appropriation of not to exceed \$10,000,000 a year to assist the schools in providing equipment for the school-lunch program. If the Senate today wishes to take \$10,000,000 out of this appropriation for that purpose it has a perfect right to vote such a provision into the bill. Experience demonstrated, however, that the amount of \$10,000,000, when it was spread all over the United States, was not very beneficial or helpful, and that more good was derived from the program by devoting the whole appropriation to food program.

In all the history of American progress there has never been a matching program so broad in its provisions as the school-lunch program. We do not require the States to match the Federal contribution. The parent-teachers associations can match it. The Kiwanis Club can match it, and does, in some instances. The Lions Club can match it, and does, in some instances. We even wrote into the bill that the amount paid into the schools by the children who were able to buy their lunches could go into a matching fund, and \$138,000,000 was so used last year. In my State, while, of course, we could use much better equipment, I do not know that the PTA's have built any warehouses, but

local civic associations have assisted greatly in equipping kitchens in order that the schools could serve lunches for the school children.

Mr. LONG. Even if my amendment were adopted it would mean that only \$4 for each school child would be provided by this appropriation. I would say that the Federal Government is very liberal respecting the conditions with respect to matching funds, but is extremely close in the matter of the amount it puts up. My State, for example, puts up \$6,000,000 annually and the Federal Government puts up \$1,500,000. The Federal Government, as I said, will match on liberal conditions, but not with considerable money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana on what his State has done in this matter. It has done more than any of the 48 States I know about in providing a school-lunch program. I congratulate the State of Louisiana on the remarkable progress it has made. Louisiana is the 1 State out of the 48 that has done what we hoped would be done when the school-lunch legislation was passed originally.

It was never thought that the school-lunch program would be financed on a 50-50 basis. The program was adopted in order to encourage the States to come in. Therefore, we wrote the measure on a sliding-scale basis of 50 percent at the outset, and then the amount the Federal Government will eventually endeavor to match is increased \$2, \$3, and \$4 a year.

Again I congratulate the State represented by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for its accomplishment in providing State support for the school-lunch program. I say with profound regret that my own State has been very niggardly in appropriating funds for this program. My State has appropriated only some administrative funds. The burden has been borne by the local civic bodies, by patriotic superintendents of schools and by others who have undertaken to mobilize local interests in an effort to provide the required matching funds and also to provide the facilities needed in the school to prepare the lunches.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to read one paragraph from a letter by the State superintendent of education of my State, which more or less indicates the attitude of my State, which has expended considerable money on school lunches.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator proposes to read it. I hope it will be disseminated throughout the country and serve as an inspiration to the school superintendents and to the State legislative bodies in the other States of the United States. I make that statement without desiring to diminish the Federal program. I am not afraid of the program becoming a socialistic program. I think the Federal Government can well afford to participate in it on a permanent basis.

Mr. LONG. I read a paragraph from the letter from the State superintendent of education of my State, as follows:

An increased Federal appropriation for food assistance and an additional appropriation

for equipment would certainly help the program in Louisiana. We need more heavy-duty equipment since more children are participating; Federal assistance in purchasing this equipment would be of real value to our program. For example, many schools serving 300 last year are now serving 1,500 children. You can readily understand that schools now serving such a large number of children need equipment in order to serve adequate lunches that meet the minimum nutritional requirements established by the Federal Government.

I may say to the Senator in that connection that one of the greatest difficulties we experienced in undertaking to expand the program in my State was that of finding larger lunch-room space, stoves, and adequate kitchen facilities.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator's State has had any difficulties in that connection, I would say the difficulties are four times greater in other States, because I understood him to say that his State appropriated four times as much as the Federal Government allotted to his State. If the Senate wants to take \$10,000,000 out of this fund for equipment, very well. But I should prefer that the bill be left as it is. Experience has shown that \$10,000,000 for equipment would not be a sufficient amount to encourage the local communities along that line. The way to go about it is to provide them with funds with which to purchase food. As a rule, when the mothers of a community see that food is available the mother instinct oftentimes causes them to go to the school kitchen to prepare the food. In many of the communities of my State the mothers rotate in working in the school kitchen. Each mother will have a day of the week when she goes to the school kitchen to prepare the school lunch. It would certainly be a revelation to Senators if they were to visit a country school in Georgia and eat a school lunch prepared by the mothers of the children who attend the school. I can assure Senators such a lunch would compare favorably with any meal they have had for some time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does the Senator not think that his suggestion that a part of the appropriation might be used to buy facilities for refrigeration might be materially affected by the difference in the amount as affected by section 32? In other words, apparently there is going to be a large amount of food available, not only because of increased production and decreased prices but likewise because of the change of status under section 32. That also tends to make even more important the purchase of facilities by the schools.

Mr. RUSSELL. That argument might well be made. But I will say to the distinguished Senator from California that the witnesses from the Pacific coast who appeared before the committee with respect to surplus foods did not indicate that there would be surpluses of perishable foods. The surpluses are of foods which have been either dried or canned and have been offered for export in years past. I do not think that much of the foods we have of which there is an impending surplus are of the extremely

perishable type. It is largely the dried foods and the canned foods which are in surplus.

As I said, I will have no quarrel if the Senate wishes to strike out the language on page 51, line 16. If the Senate strikes out that proviso, it can, if it wishes to do so, provide that a part of the money shall be used for equipment.

Mr. LONG. I have not moved to strike it out.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; but if the Senate wishes to go into the equipment phase, it can be done very simply by striking out the limitations commencing in line 16, on page 51. It is my judgment that the bill will serve more people, will be more beneficial, and strengthen the movement throughout the Nation if we leave the provision as it is. I think we will come nearer to getting the increased cooperation that is needed if we stand by the committee, and not try to go too far or too fast by adopting an amendment to increase the amount to \$100,000,000, desirable as that would be to me personally.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to make a comment. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Georgia in his statement that a large proportion of the surplus of some products from the Pacific coast at least will be nonperishable.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the evidence before the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator agrees, however, does he not, that the present Federal appropriation, with the present ratio of local matching, is extending the program only to something like 20 or 22 percent of the school children of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true. But, of course, if we are going to extend it overnight to all school pupils it would require some two or three hundred million dollars. If the Senate were to adopt such an amendment, it would load up the bill and defeat the entire school-lunch program. We are moving forward. The Senate committee has increased the amount by \$12,500,000. With declining food prices and surplus foods which are available we will be enabled to reach many school children never reached before. Once a school adopts the program it will never surrender it. I have never heard of a school—doubtless there have been some in the country, but I have never heard of one—which has adopted and maintained the school-lunch program for a reasonable length of time that would ever after that undertake to operate without it. We are going forward very rapidly, and I think that if in this program we can maintain the amount of \$87,500,000, with the favorable prospect of lower food prices, and of surplus food available under section 32, this year's progress will probably be the greatest we have ever made in extending the program throughout the United States.

For that reason I ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reference was made by the able Senator from Georgia to the fact that prices have declined, and in some instances, of course, that is definitely true, but I think I should also call attention to the testimony of a witness, Mr. Trainer, from the Department of Agriculture, who dealt with the school-lunch program. He called attention to the growing school population of the country. This is what he said:

We use, as you understand, the latest published figures of the Office of Education on enrollment. The latest figure for 1945-46 is 26,500,000 children enrolled. They estimate, however, in 1949-50 there will be 29,700,000 children in school. By 1954-55 they estimate 35,700,000 children will be in school.

In other words, there is a large increase in the school population every year, and, of course, that results in a growing demand upon the fund.

Mr. President, I have never been able to adapt my psychology to the sentiment and spirit of unnecessary compromise. It may be all right, when we are dealing with human nature and the reluctance of some people to make necessary progress, to say that we should be content with what we can get. I hope the last utterance I ever make will be aimed at striving to achieve what we ought to have; and if I am condemned as an unrealistic, impractical dreamer for saying that we ought to do what is right, I am willing to be condemned by that kind of criticism.

If the school-lunch program is right for one child out of five, it is right for five children out of five. If the United States Government is rich enough to help one child out of five to have a better body, it is rich enough to help five of its children out of five to have better bodies.

The school-lunch program is either right or wrong. If we are so niggardly, so penurious, and so bankrupt that we can help only one child out of five, we are unrealistic when we sacrifice four children to save a few hundred million dollars. That is all there is to it. Either we want the children of the country to have a good lunch, or we do not. If we want them to have it, we have the two or three or four hundred million dollars necessary to provide it. And I would like to vote the full amount now, but I know we cannot act. That is why we only have to make another small step in the right direction, above that recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

According to the estimate of my able friend, I am sure that at the rate we are going the children of most of the children now receiving the benefits of this program will be the recipients of the expanded program. At least we can expect that the grandchildren of the present recipients will surely be included within the munificence of the Federal Government, at the rate we are going. It is a question of what generation we want to help.

I am for helping the children now in school. Their bodies are now building. Their bones are being formed. We can not wait until 5 years from now to put calcium in those bones and vitamins

in those bodies. We are not saying. With our extravagant economy we are losing those children. I would just as soon not vote for any money at all as to make a discrimination, and help only one out of five, leaving four hungry. Surely we can provide a little more than the amount approved by the committee. Testimony has come to me from my State showing examples of families with as many as four children, because they could not put up the 25 cents apiece, and the local civic clubs had put up all they could provide, and the State and local agencies could put up no more, a child received a lunch only every third day; and yet those children were expected to keep up their work in school and have healthy, strong bodies, and be good citizens.

If that be impractical and unrealistic, I plead guilty. I am becoming sick and tired of having to overcome the barrage of "can't's" every time a proposal is made in the Senate for a good program. We are told "We are going too fast," or "We have not enough money. Let us be more realistic. Let us get a little now and some more next year, and perhaps an increase thereafter."

Why do we have to wait? Who says that we must wait to do right? We have not \$5,000,000,000, either, but when we really want to provide it we find it. We have not one and a half billion for arms, but when we think it is in the public interest we dig it up. We did not have \$16,000,000,000 to give the world, which was broken by the war from the end of hostilities to the beginning of the Marshall plan, but we found it, in spite of all those who spoke with alarm about the state of the budget. When the Marshall plan came along we received the shocking information that it would require \$17,000,000,000, more than all the school lunches would probably cost for the next century. But we found the \$17,000,000,000. If tomorrow we were impressed with the necessity of finding another \$17,000,000,000, somehow or other we would find it. Congress finds the money to do what it wants to do, or what it feels to be imperative.

With all deference to the Marshall plan and its advocates, I say that it is no more important than the children of America. If we can meet the demands of the Marshall plan, I see no reason why we cannot give enough aid to provide one nutritious meal at cost to the children who can buy it, and provide whatever is necessary to furnish one nutritious meal a day to those who cannot buy it.

I do not think there is anything in this country worth more than its children. We are not spending nearly as much money on our children as we spend on livestock and on many other things in which we are investing our capital. Where is there a greater return? Look at the children who have had their emaciated bodies broadened out into the bodies of children, and who ceased to be waifs and haggard specimens who almost belied their Divine Creator. Let us ask ourselves whether or not that money was well spent. All I have to say, Mr. President, is that, thank God, I am not practical when it comes to a wise expenditure of the public money.

We are told that we need four times what we are appropriating. It is admitted that we are extending aid to only one out of five children. I say that if the one child needs it, so do the five. America is rich enough, if it is good enough, to provide it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida, with his usual fluency and eloquence and with more than usual vehemence, has attacked the committee's position in this matter as being a compromise. He states with great force that he would rather vote for no money at all than to provide for only one child out of five. Unless we provide for five out of five, he would rather not vote for any appropriation at all. That being true, the distinguished Senator will, of course, have to vote against his amendment, because that amendment would provide for only about one out of four and three-quarters. It would not reach five out of five. He says that we should provide forthwith for five out of five. His amendment is as much of a compromise as is the Senate committee amendment. It would not reach all the children for whom he has so eloquently pleaded, and whose case he has presented so well.

Mr. President, this provision in the bill was the very best the committee could do. It is a compromise, just as the amendment of the Senator from Florida is a compromise. I am amazed that he would join in offering the amendment and make a speech, if we had to provide for five children out of five, when his amendment would not reach more than one out of four and three-quarters, or perhaps one and a half out of four and three-quarters, at the very best.

Mr. President, we wrote this provision in the bill in the very best way in which we could write it. We recommended total appropriations slightly below the budget estimate. If the Senate wishes to increase it above the budget estimate by \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000, it has the power to do so by adopting the pending amendment.

Whether we adopt the compromise suggested by the Senator from Florida or the committee compromise, we shall still not reach all the children. As a practical matter—and I have no fear of the word "practical"—we shall do more to expand the school-lunch program by adopting the committee amendment and endeavoring to make it stick in the conference, together with the surplus food under section 32, than we would by overloading the bill and getting it above the budget, and perhaps having it sent back to the committee where no one could predict what would happen to any item in the bill.

I think this is a reasonably well-balanced bill. A school-lunch program appeals to me as much as it does to the Senator from Florida or any other Member of the Senate. As the bill is now before us, it is a reasonable one, with the funds well distributed.

I do not know that the bill takes better care of the horses to which reference has been made, than it does of the school children. If it does, I have not located any item which would do so. There are in the bill certain appropriations of funds for the detection of diseases in

animals, but such a program will also be of value to the children of the United States, for one bite of infected meat might kill a child outright, whereas otherwise the child would have a chance to get at least two nutritious meals a day.

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment which has been proposed to the committee amendment. By such action, I think Senators will be giving more real aid to the school children of the United States than they will if they overload the bill, so far as the appropriations for this program are concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators to the committee amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on this question I simply wish to add my plea to that of the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate stand by the amendment as reported by the committee. I have served for a number of years on the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee handling the agricultural appropriations bill, as well as on other subcommittees and committees, but I have never worked with any man, either in or out of the Senate, who is more sincerely interested in agriculture in all its ramifications, and who knows more about the subject in all its ramifications, than does the Senator from Georgia. I have never known anyone better equipped to do a good job in this connection or who has tried more sincerely to do a good job in bringing to the floor of the Senate a bill which will help agriculture, than has my friend, the Senator from Georgia.

Let me say that this particular item was, above all others, nearest the heart of the Senator from Georgia. When he put this figure in the bill, it represented his best judgment, as well as the best judgment of the other members of the committee.

So, I join him in asking that the Senate support the committee, and reject the amendment proposed to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "yea," when his name was called.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Will the Chair state the pending question? Are we voting on the question of adopting the committee amendment, or on the question of adopting the amendment proposed to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is voting on the question of adopting the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, which proposal

is to strike out "\$87,500,000," and insert "\$100,000,000," on page 51, in line 16.

Mr. REED. A vote of "yea" will be a vote to substitute "\$100,000,000" for "\$87,500,000"; will it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—14

Aiken	Kefauver	Neely
Douglas	Langer	Pepper
Holland	Lodge	Taylor
Humphrey	Long	Withers
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	

NAYS—60

Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Baldwin	Hendrickson	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Butler	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Kem	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarran	Taft
Eaton	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McKellar	Thye
Frear	McMahon	Tobey
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
Green	Maybank	Williams
Gurney	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—22

Capehart	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Tydings
Eastland	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Flanders	McGrath	Wagner
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Gillette	Malone	Wiley
Graham	Miller	
Hunt	Morse	

So the amendment offered by Mr. LONG, for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement. I have received word from the Speaker of the House of Representatives that the joint session tomorrow in honor of General Dutra, the President of Brazil, will be at 12:15 p. m. When we recess today it will be until 11:45 tomorrow morning. I make the announcement so that, when the bell rings at 11:30, Senators will respond at 11:45.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3997) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the status of the bill at the present time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Have all the committee amendments been agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. On behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and of which notice has been given, which I desire to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 309. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to appropriations made in title I of this act, is authorized and directed, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to make such reductions in the amounts to be expended from the appropriations made in such title as will in the aggregate equal at least 5 percent of the total amounts so appropriated therein. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify the reduction in each appropriation account to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The amounts so certified shall not be expended but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

(b) Such reduction shall be made in a manner calculated to bring about the greatest economy in expenditure consistent with the efficiency of the service.

(c) No item of appropriation contained in title I shall be reduced more than 20 percent.

(d) A statement of each reduction hereunder, including the amount thereof, shall be included in the annual budget for the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is similar to those which have been offered to the Labor-Federal Security and the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bills. It is now offered as an amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill.

As was stated at the time this amendment was offered to the other bills, it

was not the purpose to single out any particular bill in applying this reduction procedure. This is an effort to call to the attention of the Senate an attempt to arrive at a reduction of expenditures in order to meet present conditions, as they have become known. It may be considered as a persistent effort to reduce appropriation bills in the best possible way; that is, to give to the various Government departments and agencies specific directions but to permit discretion to them to reduce the amount of an appropriation in any way they may deem feasible in order to arrive at an over-all reduction of 5 percent, but not to reduce any one particular item more than 20 percent.

The amount of the bill reported to the Senate was \$723,083,249. The Senate committee increased the bill which came from the House by \$21,961,170. So the increase in this particular appropriation over 1949 becomes \$149,194,296. It is under the estimate of the Budget Director by only \$3,823,659. If the 5-percent reduction were allowed, it would be 5 percent of \$723,083,249, or \$36,154,162.45.

Congress has had many experiences in the interpretation of laws by Government agencies themselves, and unless we take specific action, such as the amendment proposes, I think we all realize we shall be unable to decrease expenditures.

Now it has been proposed by a bill introduced in the House, as another way out, that instead of reducing expenses, the way to avoid deficit financing is to compel corporations to pay their taxes in the first half of the fiscal year rather than over the entire 12 months. But that is merely a matter of bookkeeping. It dodges the issue. As I view it, that would not solve the problem of deficit spending we are facing. Next year, we would still face the deficit prospect and we would find ourselves in further difficulty. We now have a drop in employment. Such a plan as proposed in the House would merely accelerate the drop in employment. Only the small corporations would be hurt. For instance, let us say in Michigan there are 10 large corporations and 19,000 small corporations. It is known that of the corporations that pay about \$11,000,000,000 in taxes, the small ones do not set up a reserve. They would not be able to pay out of a reserve. Many of them would find their assets only in inventory, and if they were compelled to liquidate their inventory in the first 6 months in order to meet taxes, we would find that unemployment would be accelerated rather than diminished. This is an example of what can happen if we try to find ways of dodging this problem, which can be solved only by facing it and reducing expenditures.

As I said, we cannot expect Government agencies to do this unless we are definite. To illustrate, it has recently been discovered that the United States Government has appropriated money for scholarships. We find that at least one of the persons receiving a scholarship is a Communist—two of them, as stated to the press by an able Senator who is not now on the floor. The great Government of the United States which is spending millions of dollars to fight com-

munism at least halfway round the world is making a donation, a gift, in America, to educate a person who is an avowed Communist. That does not make sense.

Only a few years ago, the able Presiding Officer offered a resolution calling for the inclusion in each appropriation bill of a proviso that appropriated funds shall not be used for payment of wages or salaries to those who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. It was adopted. The provision has been included in each bill since reported by the Appropriations Committee, and it is in the pending bill. It was in the bill last year, which provided an appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. Money included in that appropriation is now being used to educate a known Communist.

In the appropriation act there is the provision I have mentioned. The able Senator from Wyoming is chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. In that capacity, he reports that he has written a letter to the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal, in which he expressed the view that existing limitations on appropriated funds forbid payment to anyone who is a member of an organization which advocates overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. The limitation on payments, as he views it, applies to scholarship or fellowship funds.

Mr. President, naturally it would be thought, in the discretion of those who are spending the appropriation, that the law provides when it cannot be used to pay any salary or wage to a Communist, it would not be used for the purpose of educating such a person in the science of atomic energy. No. That is not what they do. They use their own solicitor's office to obtain an opinion, not the office of the Attorney General. I should say, from a reading of the provision in the bill, the solicitor may be technically correct in his interpretation. Mr. Lilienthal has stated that the Commission's legal adviser holds that such a prohibition applies only to employees of the Commission, and that fellows are not employees. I should say, from a reading of the provision in the bill, that the solicitor may be technically correct in his interpretation. But the point is that the solicitor gave the sort of opinion the Commission obviously desired. It could not have been objective.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Michigan know whether the general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission is the man who was first there as general counsel and was let out of the Navy because of his left-wing associations?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am unfamiliar with the name of the gentleman who is general counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission. The quotation from the Chairman does not give his name.

Mr. BRICKER. As the Senator remembers, the first general counsel was let out of the Navy because of what were said to be his left-wing associations.

Mr. FERGUSON. I remember very well the able junior Senator from Ohio bringing that fact to the attention of the Senate. There was no doubt as to what the record showed, and all Senators were advised as of that time.

But I raise this question, because it is very material and important that if money is to be expended in a particular way we must specifically show the purpose in the appropriation bill. Even though it could be classed as legislation on an appropriation bill, it is necessary that it be placed in the bill in no uncertain words. After the interpretation by Mr. Lilienthal's chief counsel, I feel we must place in the Atomic Energy appropriation bill, when it comes up, at least a limitation providing that no funds shall be used to educate in the science of atomic energy anyone who is a known Communist, when we are trying to prevent destruction by stopping communism elsewhere in the world.

I think, Mr. President, we must be specific in that legislation as we must now be specific in this legislation, when we seek reductions in expenditures.

We attempted to do something with reference to the Solicitor's office in 1948—

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator agree with the junior Senator from Ohio that the Atomic Energy Commission is a far more dangerous place for the Government to employ Communists than is either the Army or the Navy, in which it was testified before the House committee there are a thousand trained Communists, or in the State Department, where it is well known that Communists show up every now and then as spies for a foreign government?

Mr. FERGUSON. On the basis of the knowledge possessed by the Senator from Michigan, I think the Senator from Ohio is correct. We have today read in the press an item with reference to the disappearance of a certain amount of the U-235 material used by atomic-energy scientists—either lost, strayed, or stolen. That has obviously dangerous implications. I think it is very vital to America that if we are to educate and train men in the science of atomic energy we should train only those who are loyal to the institutions of America. After all, we are making a donation, a gift, for the purpose of educating such students, in anticipation that they will become scientists who will apply their knowledge for the benefit of America and for the benefit of the institutions of America, not for the benefit of a conspiracy which would overthrow this great Government. Should we educate those who would destroy America? That is the issue which we have before us.

We speak of freedom of thought. What is freedom of thought? It certainly does not exist in the minds of Communists. A Communist is not able to think scientifically; he must think as

he is told to think by the Communist Party. Therefore, anyone who advocates freedom of thought can certainly not advocate any such system as we have of trying to teach a person who is a Communist the science of atomic energy, with the Federal Government paying for his instruction.

Mr. President, this subject is very vital. There came before the Committee on the Judiciary a few days ago a man by the name of Crouch, if that is his correct name. He told of serving in our armed forces. He was an avowed Communist. He told the committee there were also other men in the armed services who were there for the sole purpose of receiving training as soldiers in order to overthrow the United States Government. In other words, they were being trained as soldiers to fight against the United States rather than as soldiers to fight for it. When witnesses appear before committees and testify that they entered the armed services of the United States not to get training to defend the Nation but to overthrow it, I think that fact answers the question of the junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it the judgment of the Senator from Michigan, as it is that of the junior Senator from Ohio, that the Atomic Energy Commission is the most dangerous spot in this country or in the world in which a Communist could be placed?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Michigan know that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has said that he would not only object to discontinuing such training, but would discontinue it only if it were recommended by the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that is correct, and I understand that is how he feels about it. He feels that way because he believes the Federal Government should not interfere in education. But it is not an interference with education. It is a grant to a specific person for a scholarship in order to train him to defend America through the science of atomic energy.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is there any other conceivable reason for the scholarship program of the Atomic Energy Commission than to train men to defend the United States and the peace-loving peoples of the world against tyranny?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no other idea in mind at the present time than to defend America and those who believe as America does, and who would be on the side of America in any conflict.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Then this program, as conducted and carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission and its Chairman, would defeat the very purpose of the appropriation for these scholar-

ships, namely, to defend America, and it might ultimately, if carried out in the way suggested, by training Communists, result in the destruction of the very Government it is conceived to defend and protect.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the able Senator from Ohio has stated the matter very well. If we train one man, what would prevent him from then taking a ship belonging to one of the satellite countries, let us say Poland because a Polish ship has been in the news lately, and going where he could give this information to that institution in which he believes, namely, communism? We would expect him to be able to get over there without a passport. It seems to be very easy to get on one of these ships and leave this country without even a passport.

The Commission talks about character. They say they go into the question of a man's character. I wonder whether America does not understand communism well enough to know that if a man is a Communist, that affects his character so far as being a good American is concerned.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, does the Senator understand that if the uranium 235, was either lost, stolen, or in some other way got away from the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories at Chicago, that will reveal to any enemy into whose hands it might fall some of the most innermost secrets of the whole atomic-energy program and of the use of fissionable material in bombs?

Mr. FERGUSON. I answer by saying that, from what little I know, I should think it would be very dangerous. After we have done something with a substance as in the case of the particular ore referred to, I should believe it very dangerous to have it get into the hands of unknown scientists. They would have then the processed substance to work with. I think it would be very dangerous, especially in the case of this substance, which has been deemed so important that it is transported under armed guard.

Mr. President, I remember talking to a scientist who said the scientists felt that the Senate and the House were trying to compel them to "close their windows at night," and they objected. That is the way he expressed it. He said, "Are you going to treat us scientists in this way? Are you going to require us to close our windows? You are even going to require us to clean off our desks at night." He was saying that science was world-wide, and he thought any government arbitrary and dictatorial which would say to a scientist that he had to close his windows or clean off his desk at night, and lock up the things with which he had been dealing, that is, to take security precautions.

Is it any wonder that some of this very vital material was lost, strayed, or stolen?

In my opinion, as lawyers and as legislators, we owe a high loyalty, the highest loyalty there is, to the United States of America. And any scientist, if he is being employed by our Government, even though he thinks in world-wide terms, owes his first allegiance to the United States of America rather than to any foreign government.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. It would not make a great deal of difference what the scientist thought, if the head of the Commission refused to take the recommendation of the Commission's own security officer, who is placed there to determine what is best for the security of information relating to the atomic bomb. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should have to answer the question in the affirmative. I think the reflection of what the Chairman of the Commission feels must go on down through the line. I think that all the Communists in America need to help them along is a little encouragement, and they seem to get it from many quarters.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from Michigan know that Admiral Gingrich, the security officer of the Atomic Energy Commission, has made recommendations which have been completely ignored by the Commission?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no knowledge as to that.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from Michigan know that at this very moment there is not a security officer in the Atomic Energy Commission, because Admiral Gingrich, I am informed, resigned in disgust on May the 1st?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not that knowledge, but I accept the statement of the able Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder how long the distinguished Senator expects to continue.

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a very few minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I desired to ask the majority leader how long the Senate was to continue in session this evening.

Mr. LUCAS. I had hoped that we might continue until we concluded the consideration of the bill. If the Senator from Michigan is to take some time, I shall make a motion to recess.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not bring this matter up in order to make a speech on it at this particular time. We were diverted from my original point that in the appropriation before us, as in other legislation, we must state our objectives clearly if we hope they will be accomplished.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, and I did not mean to interrupt the Senator at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am very anxious to conclude with the bill this evening if possible. However, I do not wish to lose any parliamentary rights I have in respect to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan launched into a speech before I could make a point of order against his amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can make the point or order at any time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield the floor in order that the Senator may make the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about the bill, to show why I make the point of order. I can make it tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether there will be any further motions?

Mr. WHERRY. There will be another motion or two.

Mr. FERGUSON. It depends on what happens to the pending motion.

Mr. LUCAS. After the Senator completes his remarks on this point, I think the Senate had better take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield the floor, then, with the understanding that I may have it tomorrow in order to conclude my statement on the pending amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe I would prefer to make the point of order tomorrow. I desire to make a brief statement in connection with the point of order, and I should like to do it when all Senators are free to be away from their offices.

R. C. OWEN ET AL.—VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 18, 1949.

The House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 1036) entitled "An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the message from the House relates to a veto message from the President that was acted upon by the House of Representatives today and sent to the Senate. I respectfully suggest that the bill and the message be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table until a later date, at which time I shall call it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Without objection the message and the bill will lie on the table and will be printed in the RECORD.

The message from the President, and the bill, are as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen.

The bill provides for payment of the sum of \$8,437.98, to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., which sum represents the amount they paid to the United States for internal-revenue tobacco stamps, which stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed claimants' factory, together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein.

It appears that claimants' firm was a dealer in leaf tobacco and also a manufacturer of

certain tobacco products in Gallatin, Tenn. On the night of December 24, 1945, one of the buildings belonging to the firm, part of which was used as a factory and part as a warehouse, was destroyed by fire. According to affidavits submitted by R. C. Owen, Jr., as a member of the firm, the chief of police, and the assistant chief of the fire department, the building, including its contents, was a complete loss. The firm filed a claim with the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the value of the tobacco stamps allegedly on hand in the factory at the time of the fire and therefore destroyed by it, but this claim was disapproved by that Bureau on the ground that under existing law refund could be made only where the stamps were submitted to the Bureau in a recognizable condition or were destroyed under the supervision of a deputy collector.

A person who loses currency through destruction by fire may recover such loss only to the extent that such currency can be submitted in a recognizable form for replacement. Such rule is necessary to protect the Government against fraudulent claims. A similar situation prevails with regard to postage stamps. The Government does not assume the obligation of an insurer at the time of selling internal-revenue stamps to a taxpayer for subsequent use in payment of a particular excise tax. Enactment of the bill would grant relief to this firm which is not granted to other persons similarly situated, and such special treatment would be discriminatory against taxpayers generally.

The regulations which prohibit refunds in cases of this type were promulgated with the view to preventing frauds upon the Government. The situation of claimant firm is not different from that of a number of other persons who have been refused refunds because of their inability to comply with the regulations pertaining to such refunds. The Government cannot make refund in the absence of satisfactory proof that the stamps in question were actually destroyed.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1949.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of \$8,437.98. This sum represents the amount which they paid to the United States for internal revenue tobacco stamps, which stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed the said tobacco factory of said partners (registered as "Tobacco Factory No. 102, District of Tennessee"), together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11:45 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1949, at 11:45 a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 18 (legislative day of April 11), 1949:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Harrison Parkman, of Kansas, to be purchasing agent for the Post Office Department. (A reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 37 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Daniel Collier Elkin, Medical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Taylor Kirkendall, Medical Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Harry Paul Newton, Coast Artillery Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Harry Hodges Semmes, Armored Cavalry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Lawrence Harley Whiting, Adjutant General's Department Reserve, Army of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Joseph C. Walen, director of Catholic Charities, diocese of Grand Rapids, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Direct, we beseech Thee, O Lord, our actions by Thy holy inspirations, and carry them on by Thy gracious assistance; that every prayer and work of ours may always begin from Thee, and through Thee be happily ended.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3333. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MISSING ATOMIC COMPOUND

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission is-

sues a formal statement, after the story broke in the press and on the radio, that a quantity of uranium 235 cannot be accounted for at its Chicago laboratories.

The Commission says mildly that the missing atomic compound is not believed to have been stolen or lost.

Now, when nearly one-quarter of an ounce of uranium 235 is missing, whether lost or stolen, it is a matter for concern to the whole Nation, not alone Congress.

Something is wrong somewhere. What is the degree of laxity or inefficiency in the handling of this vital element? With all the security precautions supposed to be in effect, just how could such a thing happen?

An inventory early in February revealed a discrepancy of 32 grams of U-235. The Commission floundered around until the middle of March before calling in the FBI. Now the Commission says all but 7 grams, nearly one-quarter ounce, has been accounted for, and they are looking for the missing uranium which they do not believe was lost or stolen. But where is it?

The law says that the Atomic Energy Commission must keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy currently and fully informed of all developments and all the facts. So far as I am aware, the Commission has never reported the disappearance of this U-235 to the committee.

I just want to call the attention of the House to this:

In 1945 a British spy gave a Russian espionage agent 1 milligram of U-235 compound stolen from a Chicago laboratory. This was promptly flown to Russia.

Now a quarter ounce equals about 7,000 milligrams. So you can imagine the joy in Moscow if nearly 7,000 milligrams of U-235 could come into the hands of the Kremlin's scientists.

Mr. Speaker, the disappearance of this vital element, the core and heart of the atomic bomb, must not be lightly brushed off. Congress and the people cannot be kept in the dark on such incidents as the Commission reveals today.

Any time the FBI is called in, something is drastically wrong. I ask what is wrong in the security set-up in the Commission's laboratories? Congress has the right to know.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by General White.

PECOS RIVER COMPACT

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3334) to grant the consent of the United States to the Pecos River compact.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker,

may I ask the gentleman if this bill has a unanimous report from the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. REGAN. It has.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. REGAN. This bill grants the consent of the United States to a compact between the States of Texas and New Mexico regarding the Pecos River, on which several irrigation projects have been formed during the past 40 years. The river rises in the State of New Mexico and flows into the Rio Grande within the State of Texas. The projects are in both New Mexico and Texas, and both States are unanimous in asking the consent of the Congress to this compact.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I should like to ask the majority leader or someone else in authority here with reference to a lot of the bills that are coming in here and being passed by unanimous consent, when some of us would like to have the opportunity to object to them and we are not here on the floor to do so.

The SPEAKER. No bill is called up that has not been discussed with the majority and minority leaders and the ranking members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would suggest to the gentleman that he always has the opportunity to object to a bill which comes up by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICH. The other day I was told by the minority leader that a certain bill had passed the House in reference to increased pay for Members of Congress. It would not have gone through without a complete hearing had we had the opportunity to be here while it was considered. However, we do have to eat lunch once in a while, and that applies to the majority leader and the minority leader and everybody else, so it is nothing for anyone to be off the floor when legislation of that kind comes up. I think the Speaker or the majority leader or the minority leader ought to notify the Members at least a day in advance before any legislation is considered on the floor. That would be only good, sound business procedure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would say in all fairness you cannot always tell 24 hours ahead what individual bills are coming up. In order to protect the rights of the individuals, if a minority Member will inform me at any time of any particular legislation to which he wants to object, I will be very happy to see that it is held up if he is not on the floor.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the minority leader that this is a pretty big organization here.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course it is, and its business must proceed.

Mr. RICH. The Members do not know what is coming up here. It seems to me it would only be courtesy and good busi-

ness procedure to try to let the membership know what measures are coming up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I do not believe I have ever missed the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] on the floor. He seems to be here all the time.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas if he has consulted the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and if there is any objection on the part of that committee to this measure?

Mr. REGAN. I know of no objection from anybody, including the Bureau of Reclamation, the Public Works Agency, or any other agency. It is strictly a matter between the States of Texas and New Mexico. They have been unanimous in desiring this compact. It was ratified by the two States without a dissenting vote. I hope the Congress will give consent to the compact.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so solely for the purpose of making the record straight. I do not know where the gentleman from Pennsylvania got his misinformation. There was no bill which came before the House which was passed to increase the pay for Members of Congress. I think the RECORD should be made straight and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] go back and read the RECORD and read it correctly and straighten out that observation himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to point out for the RECORD that under the Legislative Reorganization Act, which was passed by the last Congress, each Member of the other body was given an administrative assistant at \$10,300 a year. No Member of the House was given that, except the leadership, and that was done, of course, because it was vitally essential and should have been done. I think the public should know the facts. Of course, we know that demands upon Members of the House are just as much of a strain as they are upon Members of the other body. I am sure there is no difference in that respect between the two Houses at all. We are all working from 14 to 18 hours a day from what I can see, and certainly I do not apologize for the hours that I put in, and I know that all of my colleagues are putting in long hours, the same as I am. We are not asking for any sympathy, but on the other hand, we want the facts known. I think that when the public knows them, they will appreciate our position. There was a feeling that administrative assistants ought to be provided for Members of the House. I think that should be done. Proposals were made to provide for \$5,000 or \$5,500, instead of the \$10,300 salary, which the administrative assistants in the other body receive. Then a compromise was made on \$3,000. I do not think any one of us needs to apologize for what was done, if we tell the facts to the people.

So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of an increase in our salaries. I think we ought to get \$25,000 a year salary. That is my point of view. I offer no apologies for my position. I am not ashamed to go before the people of my district and tell them that I work, and that I am worth at least \$50,000 to \$75,000 a year in private practice of law, certainly I feel we ought to get a salary of \$25,000 as a Member of Congress. In any event our salary should be increased.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understood that was merely a measure to give each Member an extra clerk at \$3,000 a year. I have introduced a bill to provide each Member of Congress and each committee with an electric typewriter. I would rather have that than an extra clerk.

I think if you will investigate the proposition you will find that an electric typewriter will do more to lighten the burdens of the office of the average Congressman than anything else that we can do at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact, signed (after negotiations in which a representative of the United States, duly appointed by the President, participated and upon which he has reported to Congress) by the Commissioners for the States of New Mexico and Texas, on December 3, 1948, at Santa Fe, N. Mex., and thereafter ratified by the legislatures of each of the States aforesaid, which compact reads as follows:

PECOS RIVER COMPACT

The State of New Mexico and the State of Texas, acting through their commissioners, John H. Bliss for the State of New Mexico and Charles H. Miller for the State of Texas, after negotiations participated in by Bereley Johnson, appointed by the President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed respecting the uses, apportionment and deliveries of the water of the Pecos River as follows:

ARTICLE I

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Pecos River; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; to make secure and protect present development within the States; to facilitate the construction of works for, (a) the salvage of water, (b) the more efficient use of water, and (c) the protection of life and property from floods.

ARTICLE II

As used in this compact:

(a) The term "Pecos River" means the tributary of the Rio Grande which rises in north-central New Mexico and flows in a southerly direction through New Mexico and Texas and joins the Rio Grande near the town of Langtry, Tex., and includes all tributaries of said Pecos River.

(b) The term "Pecos River Basin" means all of the contributing drainage area of the Pecos River and its tributaries above its mouth near Langtry, Tex.

(c) "New Mexico" and "Texas" mean the State of New Mexico and the State of Texas, respectively; "United States" means the United States of America.

(d) The term "Commission" means the agency created by this compact for the administration thereof.

(e) The term "deplete by man's activities" means to diminish the stream flow of the Pecos River at any given point as the result of beneficial consumptive uses of water within the Pecos River Basin above such point. For the purposes of this compact it does not include the diminution of such flow by encroachment of salt cedars or other like growth, or by deterioration of the channel of the stream.

(f) The term "Report of the Engineering Advisory Committee" means that certain report of the Engineering Advisory Committee dated January 1948, and all appendices thereto; including, basic data, processes, and analyses utilized in preparing that report, all of which were reviewed, approved, and adopted by the Commissioners signing this compact at a meeting held in Santa Fe, N. Mex., on December 3, 1948, and which are included in the minutes of that meeting.

(g) The term "1947 condition" means that situation in the Pecos River Basin as described and defined in the report of the Engineering Advisory Committee. In determining any question of fact hereafter arising as to such situation, reference shall be made to, and decisions shall be based on, such report.

(h) The term "water salvaged" means that quantity of water which may be recovered and made available for beneficial use and which quantity of water under the 1947 condition was nonbeneficially consumed by natural processes.

(i) The term "unappropriated floodwater" means water originating in the Pecos River Basin above Red Bluff Dam in Texas, the impoundment of which will not deplete the water usable by the storage and diversion facilities existing in either State under the 1947 condition and which if not impounded will flow past Girvin, Tex.

ARTICLE III

(a) Except as stated in paragraph (f) of this article, New Mexico shall not deplete by man's activities the flow of the Pecos River at the New Mexico-Texas State line below an amount which will give to Texas a quantity of water equivalent to that available to Texas under the 1947 condition.

(b) Except as to the unappropriated floodwaters thereof, the apportionment of which is included in and provided for by paragraph (f) of this article, the beneficial consumptive use of the waters of the Delaware River is hereby apportioned to Texas, and the quantity of such beneficial consumptive use shall be included in determining waters received under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article.

(c) The beneficial consumptive use of water salvaged in New Mexico through the construction and operation of a project or projects by the United States or by joint undertakings of Texas and New Mexico is hereby apportioned 43 percent to Texas and 57 percent to New Mexico.

(d) Except as to water salvaged, apportioned in paragraph (c) of this article, the beneficial consumptive use of water which shall be nonbeneficially consumed, and which is recovered, is hereby apportioned to New Mexico but not to have the effect of diminishing the quantity of water available to Texas under the 1947 condition.

(e) Any water salvaged in Texas is hereby apportioned to Texas.

(f) Beneficial consumptive use of unappropriated floodwaters is hereby apportioned 50 percent to Texas and 50 percent to New Mexico.

ARTICLE IV

(a) New Mexico and Texas shall cooperate to support legislation for the authorization

and construction of projects to eliminate nonbeneficial consumption of water.

(b) New Mexico and Texas shall cooperate with agencies of the United States to devise and effectuate means of alleviating the salinity conditions of the Pecos River.

(c) New Mexico and Texas each may—

(i) Construct additional reservoir capacity to replace reservoir capacity made unusable by any cause.

(ii) Construct additional reservoir capacity for the utilization of water salvaged and unappropriated floodwaters apportioned by this compact to such State.

(iii) Construct additional reservoir capacity for the purpose of making more efficient use of water apportioned by this compact to such State.

(d) Neither New Mexico nor Texas will oppose the construction of any facilities permitted by this compact, and New Mexico and Texas will cooperate to obtain the construction of facilities that will be of joint benefit to the two States.

(e) The Commission may determine the conditions under which Texas may store water in works constructed in and operated by New Mexico.

(f) No reservoir shall be constructed and operated in New Mexico above Avalon Dam for the sole benefit of Texas unless the Commission shall so determine.

(g) New Mexico and Texas each has the right to construct and operate works for the purpose of preventing flood damage.

(h) All facilities shall be operated in such manner as to carry out the terms of this compact.

ARTICLE V

(a) There is hereby created an interstate administrative agency to be known as the "Pecos River Commission." The Commission shall be composed of one Commissioner representing each of the States of New Mexico and Texas, designated or appointed in accordance with the laws of each such State, and, if designated by the President, one Commissioner representing the United States. The President is hereby requested to designate such a Commissioner. If so designated, the Commissioner representing the United States shall be the presiding officer of the Commission, but shall not have the right to vote in any of the deliberations of the Commission. All members of the Commission must be present to constitute a quorum.

(b) The salaries and personal expenses of each Commissioner shall be paid by the government which he represents. All other expenses which are incurred by the Commission incident to the administration of this Compact and which are not paid by the United States shall be borne equally by the two States. On or before November 1 of each even-numbered year the Commission shall adopt and transmit to the governors of the two States and to the President a budget covering an estimate of its expenses for the following 2 years. The payment of the expenses of the Commission and of its employees shall not be subject to the audit and accounting procedures of either of the two States. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified independent public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in, and become a part of, the annual report of the Commission.

(c) The Commission may appoint a secretary who, while so acting, shall not be an employee of either State. He shall serve for such term, receive such salary, and perform such duties as the Commission may direct. The Commission may employ such engineering, legal, clerical, and other personnel as in its judgment may be necessary for the performance of its functions under

this compact. In the hiring of employees the Commission shall not be bound by the civil-service laws of either State.

(d) The Commission, so far as consistent with this compact, shall have power to:

1. Adopt rules and regulations;
2. Locate, establish, construct, operate, maintain, and abandon watergaging stations, independently or in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies;
3. Engage in studies of water supplies of the Pecos River and its tributaries, independently or in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies;
4. Collect, analyze, correlate, preserve, and report on data as to the stream flows, storage, diversions, salvage, and use of the waters of the Pecos River and its tributaries, independently or in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies;
5. Make findings as to any change in depletion by man's activities in New Mexico, and on the Delaware River in Texas;
6. Make findings as to the deliveries of water at the New Mexico-Texas State line;
7. Make findings as to the quantities of water salvaged and the amount thereof delivered at the New Mexico-Texas State line;
8. Make findings as to quantities of water nonbeneficially consumed in New Mexico;
9. Make findings as to quantities of unappropriated flood waters;
10. Make findings as to the quantities of reservoir losses from reservoirs constructed in New Mexico which may be used for the benefit of both States, and as to the share thereof charged under article VI hereof to each of the States;
11. Acquire and hold such personal and real property as may be necessary for the performance of its duties hereunder and to dispose of the same when no longer required;
12. Perform all functions required of it by this compact and do all things necessary, proper, or convenient in the performance of its duties hereunder, independently or in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies;
13. Make and transmit annually to the governors of the signatory States and to the President of the United States on or before the last day of February of each year, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year.

(e) The Commission shall make available to the governor of each of the signatory States any information within its possession at any time, and shall always provide free access to its records by the governors of each of the States, or their representatives, or authorized representatives of the United States.

(f) Findings of fact made by the Commission shall not be conclusive in any court, or before any agency or tribunal, but shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts found.

(g) The organization meeting of the Commission shall be held within 4 months from the effective date of this compact.

ARTICLE VI

The following principles shall govern in regard to the apportionment made by article III of this compact:

(a) The Report of the Engineering Advisory Committee, supplemented by additional data hereafter accumulated, shall be used by the Commission in making administrative determinations.

(b) Unless otherwise determined by the Commission, depletions by man's activities, State-line flows, quantities of water salvaged, and quantities of unappropriated flood waters shall be determined on the basis of 3-year periods reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the 1st day of January next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(c) Unless and until a more feasible method is devised and adopted by the Com-

mission the inflow-outflow method, as described in the Report of the Engineering Advisory Committee, shall be used to:

(i) Determine the effect on the State-line flow of any change in depletions by man's activities or otherwise, of the waters of the Pecos River in New Mexico.

(ii) Measure at or near the Avalon Dam in New Mexico the quantities of water salvaged.

(iii) Measure at or near the State line any water released from storage for the benefit of Texas as provided for in subparagraph (d) of this article.

(iv) Measure the quantities of unappropriated flood waters apportioned to Texas which have not been stored and regulated by reservoirs in New Mexico.

(v) Measure any other quantities of water required to be measured under the terms of this compact which are susceptible of being measured by the inflow-outflow method.

(d) If unappropriated flood waters apportioned to Texas are stored in facilities constructed in New Mexico, the following principles shall apply:

(i) In case of spill from a reservoir constructed in and operated by New Mexico, the water stored to the credit of Texas will be considered as the first water to spill.

(ii) In case of spill from a reservoir jointly constructed and operated, the water stored to the credit of either State shall not be affected.

(iii) Reservoir losses shall be charged to each State in proportion to the quantity of water belonging to that State in storage at the time the losses occur.

(iv) The water impounded to the credit of Texas shall be released by New Mexico on the demand of Texas.

(e) Water salvaged shall be measured at or near the Avalon Dam in New Mexico and to the quantity thereof shall be added a quantity equal to the quantity of salvaged water depleted by man's activities above Avalon Dam. The quantity of water salvaged that is apportioned to Texas shall be delivered by New Mexico at the New Mexico-Texas State line. The quantity of unappropriated flood waters impounded under paragraph (d) of this article, when released shall be delivered by New Mexico at the New Mexico-Texas State line in the quantity released less channel losses. The unappropriated flood waters apportioned to Texas by this compact that are not impounded in reservoirs in New Mexico shall be measured and delivered at the New Mexico-Texas State line.

(f) Beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure, and the limit of the right to use water.

ARTICLE VII

In the event of importation of water by man's activities to the Pecos River Basin from any other river basin the State making the importation shall have the exclusive use of such imported water.

ARTICLE VIII

The provisions of this compact shall not apply to, or interfere with, the right or power of either signatory State to regulate within its boundaries the appropriation, use, and control of water, not inconsistent with its obligations under this compact.

ARTICLE IX

In maintaining the flows at the New Mexico-Texas State line required by this compact, New Mexico shall in all instances apply the principle of prior appropriation within New Mexico.

ARTICLE X

The failure of either State to use the water, or any part thereof, that use of which is apportioned to it under the terms of this compact, shall not constitute a relinquishment of the right to such use, nor shall it constitute a forfeiture or abandonment of the right to such use.

ARTICLE XI

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as:

(a) Affecting the obligations of the United States under the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994);

(b) Affecting any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in or to the waters of the Pecos River, or its capacity to acquire rights in and to the use of said waters;

(c) Subjecting any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State or subdivision thereof, or creating any obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatever kind, to make any payment to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

(d) Subjecting any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to an extent other than the extent to which such laws would apply without regard to this compact.

ARTICLE XII

The consumptive use of water by the United States or any of its agencies, instrumentalities, or wards, shall be charged as a use by the State in which the use is made: *Provided*, That such consumptive use incident to the diversion, impounding, or conveyance of water in one State for use in the other State shall be charged to such latter State.

ARTICLE XIII

This compact shall not be construed as establishing any general principle or precedent applicable to other interstate streams.

ARTICLE XIV

This compact may be terminated at any time by appropriate action of the legislatures of both of the signatory States. In the event of such termination, all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

ARTICLE XV

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been ratified by the legislature of each State and approved by the Congress of the United States. Notice of ratification by the legislature of each State shall be given by the Governor of that State to the Governor of the other State and to the President of the United States, and the President is hereby requested to give notice to the Governor of each State of approval by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have executed three counterparts hereof each of which shall be and constitute an original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and one of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each State.

Done at the city of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, this 3d day of December 1948.

JOHN H. BLISS,

Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.

CHARLES H. MILLER,

Commissioner for the State of Texas.

Approved:

BERKELEY JOHNSON,

Representative of the United States of America.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by James H. Allen.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, mayor of the city of Baltimore and chairman of the standing committee on legislation at the conference of mayors.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein brief newspaper excerpts.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MULTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some extraneous material.

Mr. LODGE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is detained at home on account of serious illness in his family. I ask unanimous consent that he be granted leave of absence from his official duties for such time as is necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT—WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT IT?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a subject being granted too little attention in the Halls of Congress is that of the continuing unemployment of our citizens. Each succeeding day the problem becomes more real and pressing. In Connecticut alone almost 100,000 of our people are seeking work to keep themselves and their families in the necessities of life. Thousands have used up their total benefits under unemployment compensation, with no relief in sight. Our communities cannot absorb the welfare load being placed upon local agencies, but no solution is being proposed by the administration.

In the face of declining prices, decreased employment and production, the President maintains that the Congress should tax our people to the tune of \$4,000,000,000 more. Let us consider the problems of our own people for a change before we continue to expend all our energies and resources on those of foreign countries.

Are the administration and the Democratic majority in Congress to continue ignoring the seriousness of the present unemployment picture? Are we to tell our people that we are too busy appropriating billions for aid overseas and for armaments to help them attain a decent living standard?

Call it disinflation or what you will, but the people need help and assurance, which has not been given by our Government. A man's primary concern is the immediate preservation of his family, and that should be the subject of Government concern as well.

Let us not forget that there is no greater seed for discontent than lack of employment. A man or woman working suitable hours for decent wages is a fruitful citizen.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The latest information which I have is that there are some 13,000 unemployed in the city of Bridgeport.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is correct; and that includes only those who are on the United States unemployment compensation rolls.

In Waterbury, Conn., there are at least 10,500 unemployed at this time. That is not a true picture, because there are a great many who are working only 1 day a week.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

ADDITIONAL FBI PERSONNEL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the press today carries the story that uranium and other atom bomb secrets have been stolen. I think it makes us feel more and more the necessity for having enough FBI agents to apprehend these thieves, and to pay attention to every rumor that might lead to the capture of Communists and subversive people. I have warned and warned against subversive activities in the United States Government. It obviously still continues and very dangerously. According to the press the FBI were not notified promptly of the theft of the uranium. I do not know the details, of course, but I do state I feel very strongly the House will want to appropriate enough money to prevent thefts of this kind which affect not only the welfare of the United States but affect the welfare of all freedom-loving people in the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, what we need is for the Committee on Un-American Activities to get busy.

We investigated these Communist-front organizations when I was a member of that committee. That investigation showed that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was nothing in God's world but a Communist-front organization. Nothing has been done about it. We could get no response, if you please, from the Attorney General. When we undertook to get the Dr. Condon letter which the FBI wrote condemning Condon, the Attorney General even had it sent to the White House to keep the committee from getting it.

The American people are simply horrified to find that the Atomic Energy Commission is educating, at the expense of the Federal Government, a Communist at the University of North Carolina, teaching him how to blow up this country in the years to come.

I appeal to the Committee on Un-American Activities to get busy and investigate these subversive activities of all kinds, before it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOGARTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

**SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE
RECESSES ON MAY 19**

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**FLOOR RULES FOR JOINT SESSION,
MAY 19**

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jam we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on tomorrow during the joint session the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

**AMENDING FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE
ACT**

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3825) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3825, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, with Mr. MONRONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the bill had been considered as read, and all the Committee amendments had been agreed to. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H. R. 3825, has for its purpose the amendment of the present Crop Insurance Act by providing a formula for gradual expansion of crop insurance, which was not provided for in the revision of the act of 1947 which act placed the program on an experimental basis, and makes other important changes in the existing law to make it more applicable to the new program which has been developed since the 1947 revision of the act.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation came into being in 1938 for the purpose of insuring producers of wheat against loss due to unavoidable causes starting with the 1939 crop. In 1942 cotton was added. In 1944 flax was added on a national basis and other

crops on an experimental basis. This program was not a success. Great losses were suffered by the Corporation.

In 1947 the entire crop-insurance law was changed, revamped, and put on a sound and experimentation basis in an endeavor to fulfill two basic requirements:

First. Sound from a business standpoint, that is, capable of paying its own way and operating without loss to the Government.

Second. Offer farmers a type of insurance they want and are willing and able to pay for.

As a result of the 1947 act the insurance program is on an experimental basis with the number of commodities insurable limited and the number of counties in which insurance could be offered limited.

The coverage was limited to an amount somewhere nearer the farmer investment in the crop.

Since the overhaul and revision of the crop-insurance law in 1947, the Corporation has been on a sound basis and has gone about the job of establishing a crop-insurance program under the new law in a forthright and businesslike manner.

Due to the restriction in the number of counties in which insurance could be offered under the experimental program, insurance has been denied to many farmers who wanted it, as well as to a good many counties who had a favorable crop-insurance record. It is believed that the Corporation, although still on an experimental basis, is ready for an orderly expansion of the program of the types of insurance which appear to be on a sound actuarial basis. The development of sound crop insurance is only part of the objective sought by Congress. The other part is the extension of crop insurance as fast as is justified to farmers to whom insurance is not now available. The bill under consideration provides a formula for such expansion. It authorizes as to each type of insurance an increase each year of not to exceed 50 percent of the number of counties in which that type of insurance was available the previous year, beginning in the year 1950. This, of course, does not mean that the insurance in each commodity in the program will be increased 50 percent each year, but this allows for an orderly increase not to exceed that amount, and it is contemplated that the expansion will take place only as the experience of the Corporation and the demand for the insurance justifies.

The present law limits the insurance to not more than seven agricultural commodities, including wheat, cotton, flax, corn, and tobacco and not more than three additional agricultural commodities in each year thereafter. Insurance is limited to producers in not to exceed 200 counties in the case of wheat, 56 counties in the case of cotton, 50 counties each in the case of corn and flax, 35 counties in the case of tobacco, 20 counties in the case of any other agricultural commodity. The present bill provides a new and promising type of crop insurance, tried experimentally in two counties during the 1948 crop year and being expanded to

seven counties in 1949, to be known as multiple-crop insurance. In this type of insurance all major crops on the farm may be insured, although the crops are to be considered separately in considering the amount of coverage and premium rate, thereby guaranteeing the farmer a return from all insured crops equal to the amount of his insurance. In other words, if the return from all crops combined is less than this amount, the farmer is then indemnified the difference, which means that losses are not determined separately on individual crops.

This type of insurance is authorized in 50 counties with the same formula for expansion applying as in the commodity-insurance program.

As has been previously stated, prior to the new act of 1947 going into effect, the crop-insurance program was conducted at considerable loss. Since the new experimental program has been in effect, it has operated on a sound basis. It is thought, therefore, that it is only fair that the loss under the old program be charged off as part of the loss of developing crop insurance on a trial-and-error basis and that the experimental program on which the corporation is now engaged not be burdened with the deficit of the trial-and-error program.

This bill charges off the deficit of approximately \$73,000,000 that was incurred under the old program.

The present law has a provision in it that, if the premiums and reserves on any commodity are not adequate in any year to meet the losses on any commodity, the losses would be paid only on a pro rata production basis which means that farmers would have no guaranteed protection in any widespread failure and it would not be possible to indemnify a farmer for any loss until the entire loss was known and the claims approved. The present bill remedies that situation.

The present law provides that, starting in 1950, the administrative expenses shall be limited to not in excess of 25 percent of the premium collected the preceding year, which provision was adopted in 1944 while the program was on a Nation-wide basis. We are now on an experimental basis, with the hopes that crop insurance will be expanded. This provision will greatly hamper the expansion program, and since the Congress appropriates annually to cover the needs for the Corporation it appears that there is no need for the present limitation and the bill eliminates this provision.

The present law does not cover insurance on livestock. We have recently experienced what can happen to livestock producers. No insurance is available to them. This act authorized the Corporation to conduct research on livestock insurance.

The present law provides that insurance shall be against loss of the insured commodity while in the field due to unavoidable causes. The present bill leaves out the words "while in the field," which will enable the Corporation to conduct its insurance protection until the crop is ready for market.

In most instances the crop is ready for market when it is threshed or otherwise housed in the field. But this is not true as to every crop, particularly tobacco, which crop is not ready for market until it has remained sometime in the curing barn. This amendment permits the Corporation to insure such crops until they are a marketable commodity and their value can be determined. There is no available private insurance to cover this phase of the curing of the crops. Due to the fact that disease or insects can cause much damage while the crop is in the barn being cured and made ready for the market.

All in all, it is thought that much progress has been made since the 1947 act. Provisions in this bill will be most helpful in carrying out the intent of the Congress and in expanding a sound, real insurance program that will be of help to the producers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONRONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3825) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, pursuant to House Resolution 212, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3083) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on behalf of the minority there is no objection, but I should like to point out that the Senate has raised the House bill beyond all reason and I certainly hope the conference committee will be able to bring back

something closely resembling the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARY, FERNANDEZ, PASSMAN, CANNON, CANFIELD, and COUDERT.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1 o'clock.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock p. m.

R. C. OWEN AND OTHERS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report (No. 611) from the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 1036 OVER VETO MESSAGE

Mr. CELLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., together with the objections of the President thereto, having reconsidered said bill and the objections of the President thereto, report the same back to the House with the recommendation that said bill do pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

This bill, H. R. 1036, provides for payment of the sum of \$8,437.98 to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn.; such sum represents the amount which they paid to the United States for internal-revenue tobacco stamps; such stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed claimants' factory, together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein.

These stamps, which were in various denominations, were valued at \$8,437.98, which was the price paid for them by the said manufacturer. The Treasury Department requires the manufacturer, through his collector of internal revenue, to always keep a record reflecting the amount of stamps on hand and that a report of this balance be returned to the collector once each month. The collector did not require that the records show the various denominations of the stamps but only their total value. The report to the collector reflected only the total value. These records were properly kept by the Owens and at the time of the fire showed stamps on hand of the value set forth in this bill, which were completely destroyed by fire. Not only did the records of the Owens show this but the records of the collector's office at Nashville, Tenn., showed the same thing.

Immediately after the fire, R. C. Owen filed claim on form 843 with the collector of

internal revenue, Nashville, Tenn., seeking a refund of the value of the stamps or the stamps themselves replaced, as provided for in sections 156 and 3304, title 26, United States Code Annotated. This claim was filed January 10, 1946. At the time of the fire the records of R. C. Owen indicated the exact amount of the stamps on hand, as well as the amount with which R. C. Owen was charged by the collector of internal revenue. Soon after the fire, Mr. S. C. Willis, a deputy collector for the Nashville, Tenn., office, investigated the fire, acknowledged the loss of these stamps by the fire, and R. C. Owen was given credit against his inventory for these stamps and was no longer charged with them by the collector of internal revenue. This claim has been rejected by the collector of internal revenue and, in turn, rejected by the Commissioner in Washington. The reason given was that heretofore the Secretary of the Treasury ruled that no refund or redemption might be allowed unless the stamps themselves were submitted. However, in this instance, the fire was of an unknown origin and there was no way to submit the stamps or the destruction of the same being supervised by the Commissioner.

The Treasury Department in its report states: "As is commonly known, a person having the misfortune of losing an amount of currency through destruction by fire may recover his loss by claim upon the Government only to the extent that the currency can be submitted in recognizable form for replacement. Obviously, that rule is necessary to protect the Government against fraudulent claims."

The veto message states: "It appears that claimants' firm was a dealer in leaf tobacco and also a manufacturer of certain tobacco products in Gallatin, Tenn. On the night of December 24, 1945, one of the buildings belonging to the firm, part of which was used as a factory and part as a warehouse, was destroyed by fire. According to affidavits submitted by R. C. Owen, Jr., as a member of the firm, the chief of police, and the assistant chief of the fire department, the building, including its contents, was a complete loss. The firm filed a claim with the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the value of the tobacco stamps allegedly on hand in the factory at the time of the fire and therefore destroyed by it, but this claim was disapproved by that Bureau on the ground that under existing law refund could be made only where the stamps were submitted to the Bureau in a recognizable condition or were destroyed under the supervision of a deputy collector.

"A person who loses currency through destruction by fire may recover such loss only to the extent that such currency can be submitted in a recognizable form for replacement. Such rule is necessary to protect the Government against fraudulent claims. A similar situation prevails with regard to postage stamps. The Government does not assume the obligation of an insurer at the time of selling internal-revenue stamps to a taxpayer for subsequent use in payment of a particular excise tax. Enactment of the bill would grant relief to this firm which is not granted to other persons similarly situated, and such special treatment would be discriminatory against taxpayers generally.

"The regulations which prohibit refunds in cases of this type were promulgated with the view to preventing frauds upon the Government. The situation of claimant firm is not different from that of a number of other persons who have been refused refunds because of their inability to comply with the regulations pertaining to such refunds. The Government cannot make refund in the absence of satisfactory proof that the stamps in question were actually destroyed.

"Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill."

The attention of the House is called to a report submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, dated August 26, 1948, which states as follows:

"FOR THE RELIEF OF JAMES G. SMYTH (INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTOR)

"The facts in the case are as follows: On April 6, 1948, Mrs. Idyl Acuff, stamp deputy of the Santa Rosa, Calif., branch office of the first California internal revenue collection district, received a shipment of wine stamps from the main office at San Francisco, Calif. The shipment consisted of 50,000 stamps of the 60-cent denomination, 50,000 stamps of the \$1.44 denomination, 10,000 stamps of the \$5 denomination, and 100 stamps of the \$500 denomination. The stamps were unwrapped and counted by Mrs. Acuff and found to agree with the invoice. Pending verification of the count, the wrappings were preserved on top of one of the safes, of which there were three in the Santa Rosa office. In storing the stamps, the Santa Rosa office keeps those of large denominations, used for evidencing tax payment on tank lot withdrawals, in a separate manila envelope. To complete storage of the shipment in question, this envelope was taken from the safe for insertion of the \$500 denomination stamps, consisting of 2 sheets of 50 each. The prior contents of the envelope consisted of 31 stamps of the \$3,000 denomination. All evidence points to the fact that through some quirk of fate the envelope was associated with the shipment wrappings which were deposited in a waste basket after verification of their contents. Early the next morning the janitor dumped the contents of the office waste baskets into a pasteboard carton, without examination of the contents, and incinerated the carton in the building furnace.

"Later in the morning of April 7, 1948, the office had an order for a \$3,000 denomination of stamp, and, not being able to locate the envelope, Mrs. Acuff and Deputy Collector Walter J. Butler went to the furnace room to examine the wastepaper collection, but which in the meantime had been incinerated. The ashes were raked out, but all paper had been completely consumed by fire.

"This stamp loss was thoroughly investigated by Special Intelligence Agent Anthony Sherman with the conclusion that the stamps were destroyed as stated.

"Shortly after the stamp loss was discovered the Santa Rosa office was checked and examined by Supervisor of Accounts and Collections Frank L. Blote, who found the stamp accounts in perfect condition, except for the shortage of 100 stamps of the \$500 denomination and 31 stamps of the \$3,000 denomination. There was no evidence of the safes having been tampered with or in fact of any theft. Acting District Supervisor J. F. Corridan, alcohol tax unit, will have all \$500 and \$3,000 wine stamps presented for cancellation in his district checked against purchase orders as a cautionary measure.

"This department is satisfied that the Government has suffered no loss in this case and recommends that bill H. R. 6562 for the relief of James G. Smyth be favorably considered."

The committee is unable to reconcile these two reports. Public Law No. 321 of the Eightieth Congress is as follows:

"That the General Accounting Office is authorized, after consideration of the pertinent findings and if in concurrence with the determinations and recommendations of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, to relieve any disbursing or other accountable officer or agent or former disbursing or other accountable officer or agent of any such department or

independent establishment of the Government charged with responsibility on account of physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers in his charge, if the head of the department or independent establishment determines (1) that such loss or deficiency occurred while such officer or agent was acting in the discharge of his official duties; or that such loss or deficiency occurred by reason of the act or omission of a subordinate of such officer or agent; and (2) that such loss or deficiency occurred without fault or negligence on the part of such officer or agent. This act shall be applicable only to the actual physical loss or deficiency of Government funds, vouchers, records, checks, securities, or papers, and shall not include deficiencies in the accounts of such officers or agents resulting from illegal or erroneous payments."

And relief has been given many Government employees under this law. However, there is no law to give relief to private business, and it would appear to the committee that it is discriminatory for the departments to give relief to Federal employees and to oppose legislation which passed the Congress for the relief of private business.

The report in connection with relief for James G. Smyth, collector for the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the west California district, is not consistent with the report and veto on H. R. 1036 for the relief of the R. C. Owen Tobacco Co. Also, in this report it is stated that the Department was satisfied that the Government had suffered no loss in this case and recommended that it be given favorable consideration. The Committee on the Judiciary is unable to see where the Government had any loss in the R. C. Owen Tobacco Co. claim. The amount in which the Treasury Department desires to relieve Mr. Smyth is \$143,000, while the Owen claim amounts to only \$8,437.98. The Treasury Department also states that to give the Owens relief would be giving special treatment in discrimination against taxpayers generally. It would appear that the same situation should apply to Mr. Smyth, the internal-revenue collector of California. However, the Department doesn't appear to feel that way about the matter.

[H. Doc. 161, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, RETURNING WITHOUT APPROVAL A BILL (H. R. 1036) FOR THE RELIEF OF R. C. OWEN, R. C. OWEN, JR., AND ROY OWEN

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen.

The bill provides for payment of the sum of \$8,437.98, to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., which sum represents the amount they paid to the United States for internal-revenue tobacco stamps, which stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed claimants' factory, together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein.

It appears that claimants' firm was a dealer in leaf tobacco and also a manufacturer of certain tobacco products in Gallatin, Tenn. On the night of December 24, 1945, one of the buildings belonging to the firm, part of which was used as a factory and part as a warehouse, was destroyed by fire. According to affidavits submitted by R. C. Owen, Jr., as a member of the firm, the chief of police, and the assistant chief of the fire department, the building, including its contents, was a

complete loss. The firm filed a claim with the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the value of the tobacco stamps allegedly on hand in the factory at the time of the fire and therefore destroyed by it, but this claim was disapproved by that Bureau on the ground that under existing law refund could be made only where the stamps were submitted to the Bureau in a recognizable condition or were destroyed under the supervision of a deputy collector.

A person who loses currency through destruction by fire may recover such loss only to the extent that such currency can be submitted in a recognizable form for replacement. Such rule is necessary to protect the Government against fraudulent claims. A similar situation prevails with regard to postage stamps. The Government does not assume the obligation of an insurer at the time of selling internal-revenue stamps to a taxpayer for subsequent use in payment of a particular excise tax. Enactment of the bill would grant relief to this firm which is not granted to other persons similarly situated, and such special treatment would be discriminatory against taxpayers generally.

The regulations which prohibit refunds in cases of this type were promulgated with the view to preventing frauds upon the Government. The situation of claimant firm is not different from that of a number of other persons who have been refused refunds because of their inability to comply with the regulations pertaining to such refunds. The Government cannot make refund in the absence of satisfactory proof that the stamps in question were actually destroyed.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1949.

H. R. 1036

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT THE FIRST SESSION, BEGUN AND HELD AT THE CITY OF WASHINGTON ON MONDAY, THE 3D DAY OF JANUARY 1949

An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, former partners doing business as R. C. Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of \$8,437.98. This sum represents the amount which they paid to the United States for internal revenue tobacco stamps, which stamps were completely destroyed on December 24, 1945, when a fire destroyed the said tobacco factory of said partners (registered as "Tobacco Factory No. 102, District of Tennessee"), together with the equipment, tobacco, and tobacco stamps therein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

President of the Senate pro tempore.
[Endorsement on back of bill.]

I certify that this act originated in the House of Representatives.

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that the Committee on the Judiciary asks that this action be taken, mainly to pass the bill H. R. 1036, the President's veto notwithstanding. I personally feel apologetic in asking this action but the merits of the case demand just such action. The bill provides for relief of a concern operated by R. C. Owen, his son, and brother in Tennessee, in pursuance of a bill offered by our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The Government has suffered no loss. There was a fire in which a number of tobacco stamps was destroyed. There was no evidence whatsoever of any negligence, any fraud, any deceit, or any chicanery on the part of these tobacco merchants. This was a clean-cut case. It is a most praiseworthy case and relief should be afforded. It is rather anomalous that in a number of these cases where the Committee on the Judiciary has given relief and the House approved the action of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Treasury Department has approved the granting of relief. Such cases were on all fours with the instant case. But here the Treasury, for some unknown reason, denies relief. I cannot understand such inconsistency. In cases where stamps and even currency was destroyed the Treasury agrees to restitution. In this case the Treasury stubbornly says "No."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, this is a case where a citizen loses by fire tobacco stamps for which he had paid the Government \$8,437.98. The deputy collector of internal revenue admits that these stamps had been purchased and were in the hands of the purchasers in their place of business in Gallatin, Tenn., at the time they were burned and completely destroyed on the night of December 24, 1945.

In a similar case, James G. Smyth, internal revenue collector of Santa Rosa, Calif., lost by fire wine stamps of the value of and for which he was charged \$143,000 by the internal revenue department. The department recommended the passage of a bill to relieve Mr. Smyth of all liability for said loss. Not only that, but in the last hours of the Eightieth Congress this House passed a bill that had been passed by the Senate, that had also been introduced and sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] for the relief of one of his constituents who was a member of the armed forces of the United States and was captured on Corregidor, and who turned over \$1,800 of his money to one of his superior officers who was also a prisoner of the Japanese on the ship on which he, along with many others, was being transported to Japan. The ship was sunk by the Japs. The money was

lost. Of course, this soldier had no trace of the money. He was unable to offer it in evidence in support of his claim. Very properly this House passed the bill to reimburse him for the loss of his money, and the President signed the bill.

In my opinion, this is a meritorious claim, just as is another claim which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of this House. It is not a partisan matter. The question before us now is: Shall we deal justly with an American citizen? Here now, in this House, is the only place to which he can go for justice. Let us give it to him.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Did the Department of the Government admit that these stamps were in the possession of this man?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. They did admit it, and the Deputy Collector of Internal Revenue had supervision of this plant. He reported that there was a fire from unknown causes, which actually destroyed these stamps. And he recommended that the refund be made. But his chiefs in Washington repudiated his recommendation.

Mr. COLMER. This specific amount of stamps?

Mr. CELLER. Correct. Apparently, the officials in Washington refused to abide by the report of the local agent. Treasury said it would refund if evidence of the stamps, even if mutilated or marred, were produced. How can you produce any vestige of stamps if they were destroyed by fire? The Treasury is wrong, and unfortunately the President, urged by the Treasury, is in error. Our action in passing the bill over the President's veto is no reflection on our President, whom we honor and revere. His has been a mistake in judgment in following too closely on the matter the Treasury's recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that in a matter of this character, this tobacco merchant buys his stamps from the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the local collector's office where a record is kept?

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. That is a record of the stamps purchased?

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. And likewise a record is kept of the stamps used?

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. So that in this case, dealing with a matter of revenue stamps, if there was a fire and the stamps were destroyed, the Bureau of Internal Revenue would have a record of the stamps sold and a record of the stamps used. So that the element of fraud would be out of this picture almost conclusively, would it not?

Mr. GORE. The gentleman states a situation which is the fact in this case.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot see any reason why we do not support the committee on this matter.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Do not the facts disclose that the record of the Department and the record of the claimant under this bill coincide to the penny?

Mr. GORE. Absolutely.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. The Department makes an adverse report in this matter on two grounds: First, that the people who lost these stamps in this fire could not reproduce the burned stamps; second, because the fire did not occur under the auspices and supervision of the Revenue Department.

Mr. GORE. I am grateful for the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. If I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] correctly, he gave an instance of a bill being passed in the last Congress to pay the claim of a soldier on Corregidor, who turned his money over to an officer, and then it was lost at sea, and that bill passed the House and was approved by the President. Now, why should we approve that bill and not approve this one?

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman from New York. I wonder if the Members would not let me first make a statement of the case. I know it is new to many Members of the House. Of course, I felt reluctant to request the Judiciary Committee to favorably report a bill to pass over the President's veto, which seeks to relieve only one citizen of this great United States of America. It is a small thing upon which to claim the attention of the House, but often the test of the efficacy of a democracy is the manner in which it can deal with small things, individual citizens, for instance.

Here is a just claim, in my opinion. I would like to say that, although this man is a constituent of mine, he is, upon occasion, of opposite political persuasion. I owe him no personal or political obligation, but he is a fellow citizen and a constituent, and, in my opinion, he has a just claim. When a citizen has a just claim he is entitled to relief some place. This citizen has been denied relief except on the floor of Congress.

What are the facts? He is a small manufacturer of smoking tobacco. He possessed certain Government revenue stamps, an obligation, mind you, which the Congress imposed upon him in consequence of the operation of his business. Also, we impose upon all private citizens having revenue stamps—and this differentiates between the case of currency destruction and revenue stamps as referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin—the obligation of keeping an accurate inventory of the stamps in his

possession; likewise, the collector of internal revenue is required to keep an accurate inventory of the revenue stamps in the possession of all citizens. On Christmas eve night, 1945, this small but old concern burned, burned completely. There is incontrovertible evidence that the stamps were burned; as a matter of fact, the deputy collector of internal revenue at Nashville, Tenn., came out and investigated the fire. His inventory compared to the penny with the inventory of this private citizen who possessed Government revenue stamps, not because he courted them but because his Government imposed upon him the obligation of placing such stamps upon his product.

After investigation, the deputy collector relieved this private citizen of the obligation of possession, crediting his inventory with destruction of stamps. Thereby, this agent of the Government recognized and acknowledged the destruction of these stamps by fire.

This is no partisan matter; I think enactment of this bill might serve well to bring some order out of chaos, this uncoordinated writing of veto messages by various Government agencies which, of course are—well, I do not see how the President of the United States could possibly give very much time and attention to a veto message upon so small a matter as this. Whether or not he actually wrote the message I do not know, but the message of the veto is on all fours with the statement of the Treasury Department in opposition to enactment of the bill. Despite the Treasury objection, this Congress passed the bill unanimously.

I find, however, that the Treasury Department sent up a recommendation for the passage of a bill providing relief in the amount of \$143,000 to the collector of internal revenue of the State of California for revenue stamps which he said were lost. He lost them. He thinks they found their way into the waste basket, and in all probability burned. The Treasury now recommends under those circumstances, that because this internal revenue collector misplaced or lost stamps which may have found their way into the incinerator, they recommend giving that fellow relief. On what grounds? Because, as they say, the Government suffered no loss.

We know what happened to my constituent's stamps; they got burned up; and neither did the Government suffer any loss in this case. This manufacturer, this small-business man, bought the stamps from the internal revenue collector and paid for them. They are gone, now, transmuted into carbon and gas.

In the first instance, this claim is just; in the second instance, I think it is right for this Congress to give relief to an individual citizen who has a just claim who cannot get relief any other place.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I merely wish to state that I know the parties who bought these

stamps. They are honorable and upright citizens. They would not make a false statement. They are very honorable, outstanding citizens.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I may say to the gentleman that he is exactly right in his presentation here and he is supported and substantiated by the facts. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary that first had to do with this bill reported it favorably and unanimously. The full committee acting upon their recommendation did likewise. When the bill was vetoed and came back to our committee for decision as to whether it would be voted up or down, to the contrary of the President's veto, it was likewise unanimously voted that the bill should be brought before the House for decision.

I am a Democrat and I have a great amount of loyalty to my party and to my President, but if I have to make a choice between a friendship on the one hand and right or wrong on the other, I will vote to override the President's veto if I think he is wrong. The gentleman is right, his constituent is right and is entitled to a rebate, and I am going to vote to override the veto.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able and forthright gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee dealing with this claim, it appears to me that it is a just claim and that the only distinction between the claim of the gentleman from Tennessee and that which was approved by a Government department is that the gentleman's constituent did not happen to be one of the boys.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman's assistance is appreciated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that the President does not personally pass upon vetoes of this nature; that they are written by someone down in a department?

Mr. GORE. In this case I do not know.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think the gentleman has made an excellent case; and if he will let the House vote, I believe we will pass his bill.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman. Perhaps he has made a valuable suggestion.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 49, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—318

Abbott	Dollinger	Kearney
Abernethy	Dondero	Kearns
Albert	Donohue	Keating
Allen, Calif.	Douglas	Keefe
Allen, Ill.	Eaton	Kennedy
Allen, La.	Elliott	Kerr
Andersen	Ellsworth	Kilburn
H. Carl	Elston	Kilday
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Kirwan
Andresen	Engle, Calif.	Klein
August H.	Evins	Kruse
Andrews	Fallon	Kunkel
Angell	Fellows	Lane
Aspinall	Fenton	Lanham
Auchincloss	Fernandez	Larcade
Bailey	Fisher	Latham
Barden	Flood	LeCompte
Baring	Fogarty	LeFevre
Barrett, Pa.	Forand	Lemke
Barrett, Wyo.	Ford	Lesinski
Bates, Ky.	Frazier	Lind
Bates, Mass.	Fugate	Lodge
Battle	Fulton	Lovre
Beall	Furcolo	Lyle
Beckworth	Gamble	Lynch
Bennett, Fla.	Garmatz	McCarthy
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	McConnell
Bentsen	Gathings	McCulloch
Biemiller	Gavin	McDonough
Bishop	Gillette	McGregor
Blackney	Golden	McGuire
Bland	Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.
Blatnik	Gore	McMillen, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Gorski, Ill.	Mack, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Gorski, N. Y.	Mack, Wash.
Bolling	Gossett	Magee
Bolton, Md.	Graham	Mansfield
Bolton, Ohio	Granahan	Marsalis
Bosone	Grant	Martin, Iowa
Bramblett	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Breen	Hagen	Mason
Brehm	Hale	Morrow
Brown, Ga.	Hall	Michener
Brown, Ohio	Leonard W.	Miles
Bryson	Halleck	Miller, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Hand	Miller, Md.
Burdick	Harden	Mills
Burke	Hardy	Mitchell
Burleson	Hare	Monroney
Burnside	Harris	Morris
Burton	Harrison	Morton
Byrne, N. Y.	Harvey	Multer
Byrnes, Wis.	Havener	Murray, Tenn.
Camp	Hays, Ark.	Murray, Wis.
Carlyle	Hays, Ohio	Nelson
Carroll	Hébert	Nicholson
Case, N. J.	Hedrick	Nixon
Cavalcante	Heller	Noland
Celler	Herter	Norblad
Chelf	Heselton	Norrell
Chilperfield	Hill	O'Hara, Minn.
Chudoff	Hinshaw	O'Konski
Church	Hobbs	O'Neill
Clemente	Hoeven	Passman
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Ill.	Patten
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman, Mich.	Patterson
Colmer	Holfield	Peterson
Combs	Holmes	Philbin
Cooper	Hope	Phillips, Calif.
Corbett	Horan	Phillips, Tenn.
Cotton	Howell	Poage
Coudert	Huber	Polk
Cox	Jackson, Calif.	Potter
Crawford	Jackson, Wash.	Poulson
Crook	Jacobs	Powell
Cunningham	James	Preston
Dague	Javits	Price
Davenport	Jenison	Priest
Davis, N. Y.	Jenkins	Rains
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Rankin
Davis, Wis.	Johnson	Redden
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
DeGraffenried	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Rees
Denton	Judd	Regan
D'Ewart	Karst	Rhodes

Richards	Stanley	Wadsworth
Riehlman	Steed	Walter
Rivers	Stefan	Weichel
Rodino	Stigler	Welch, Mo.
Rogers, Mass.	Stockman	Werdel
Sadlak	Sullivan	Wheeler
St. George	Sutton	White, Calif.
Sanborn	Taber	Whitten
Sasser	Tackett	Whittington
Scott, Hardie	Talle	Wickersham
Scrivner	Tauriello	Wier
Scudder	Teague	Wigglesworth
Shafer	Thomas, Tex.	Williams
Sheppard	Thompson	Willis
Short	Thornberry	Wilson, Okla.
Sikes	Tollefson	Winstead
Simpson, Ill.	Towe	Withrow
Sims	Trimble	Wolcott
Smathers	Van Zandt	Wolverton
Smith, Kans.	Veide	Woodruff
Staggers	Vursell	Zablocki

NAYS—49

Addonizio	Kean	Perkins
Brooks	Kelley	Quinn
Buchanan	Keogh	Rabaut
Buckley, Ill.	Linehan	Ramsay
Cannon	McGrath	Ribicoff
Carnahan	McKinnon	Sabath
Chesney	McSweeney	Spence
Christopher	Madden	Vorvys
Dawson	Marcantonio	Wagner
Doyle	Marshall	Walsh
Eberharter	Miller, Nebr.	Weich, Calif.
Gordon	Morgan	White, Idaho
Granger	O'Brien, Ill.	Worley
Green	O'Brien, Mich.	Yates
Hart	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
Heffernan	O'Sullivan	
Karsten	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—64

Arends	Hull	Pickett
Bonner	Irving	Plumley
Boykin	Jensen	Rich
Buckley, N. Y.	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Canfield	Kee	Rooney
Case, S. Dak.	King	Sadowski
Chatham	Lichtenwalter	Scott,
Clevenger	Lucas	Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	McCormack	Secrest
Crosser	Macy	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis	Mahon	Smith, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.	Meyer	Smith, Va.
Dingell	Morrison	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	Moulder	Taylor
Doughton	Murdock	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	Murphy	Underwood
Feighan	Norton	Vinson
Gilmer	Pace	Whitaker
Gregory	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Gwinn	Pfeifer	Wilson, Tex.
Hall,	Joseph L.	Wood
Edwin Arthur Pfeiffer,	William L.	Woodhouse
Herlong		

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Irving with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Pickett with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. King with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CHANGE OF CONFEREES ON GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MAY 18, 1949.

Mr. SPEAKER: On account of previous engagements over the week end I will not be in Washington and I have asked of my chairman, Mr. DAWSON, that another be selected in my place as conferee on the reorganization bill, H. R. 2361.

Thanks for your consideration.

I am,

Respectfully,

ROBERT F. RICH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] as a substitute conferee; and the Clerk will notify the Senate of the change.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor considering the bill H. R. 4453 may sit during general debate during sessions of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Mr. Clark L. Brody, executive secretary of the Michigan Farm Bureau.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement in regard to payments to retired Army men.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. MCKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in the newspaper.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of shortage of doctors in the Department of National Defense.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article from the Chicago Daily News on conditions in the country, and in the other a speech delivered by the Honorable James Farley to the Boys' Club in Chicago.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 62, Rept. No. 612), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 62.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Lobbying Activities (hereinafter referred to as the committee), which shall be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment. The members of the committee shall select a chairman from among their number. The members of the committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the committee—

(1) to make a full and complete investigation of all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation;

(2) to make a full and complete investigation of all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation;

(3) to report from time to time to the Senate (or to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session) and to the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, documents, and tangible things, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such binding and printing, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by him. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings as the committee may hold shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. The committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after I conclude I will yield 30 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Members heard the reading of this resolution, so consequently I will make a short explanation of what it intends to do. The resolution intends to appoint a joint committee of the House and the Senate, seven Members from each body, four Democrats and three Republicans from the House, and the same from the Senate, for the purpose of investigating the lobbyists that have infested this Capitol for these many years, especially the last few years. This resolution has been broadened by the Committee on Rules so that it will also embrace activities of the agencies of the Federal Government. It provides for making a full and complete investigation of all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation, also to make a full and complete investigation of all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

From time to time we have heard from many of these gentlemen, some of whom draw as much as \$150,000 a year, lobbying and trying to urge and retard various legislation for which they have been hired by corporations or groups. However, many times these lobbyists have succeeded in securing employment from various manufacturers and businessmen under the pretense that they can influence and sway the Members of Congress. In many instances these lobbyists obtain their money by fraud and misrepresentation, because I know of many of them, and I know they cannot deliver anybody, and further, I doubt very much that they can influence the membership. However, they are here annoying and harassing the Members from day to day. I feel that we should know just exactly what legislation should be enacted to put a stop to this infamous practice that has prevailed now for many years.

I remember years ago when the country was very excited over the legislation intended to affect the activities of the holding companies and power combines, as evidenced by the report that they spent over \$2,000,000 under the leadership of Hopson in an endeavor to kill that legislation, which they designated as a death sentence to the power and utility companies. As many of you older Members recall, this legislation was eventually enacted and the power companies are still very much alive notwithstanding the fact that this law is on the statute books today.

I know that in the last few years many more millions have been spent on the part of many corporations and businesses who are endeavoring to enact legislation in their favor and stop legis-

lation which they are opposed to. Many of you older members remember that I have attacked these professional lobbyists for years. I introduced a bill 4 years ago, the provisions of which are embodied in the present Legislative Reorganization Act but which unfortunately, is not clear enough and does not go far enough, for the abuses still continue. This committee will recommend "teeth" that can properly be enacted into law thereby eliminating these abuses.

I am indeed gratified and it gives me sincere pleasure to support the resolution that has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], a man of great ability and a person with an exceptionally fair mind. If appointed chairman of this committee to investigate lobby activities, as I believe he will, I am certain that he will make a thorough and honest investigation without any unjustified smearing of anyone, for I am confident that such an investigation will give us an opportunity and basis for proceeding further on corrective legislation designed to eliminate permanently these infamous lobbying practices. I intended to mention the names of some of these lobbyists but I will forego mentioning their names because I feel that after the committee has been appointed and makes its investigation, light will be shed on some of those things in this regard, which came to my attention during the last few years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to inquire of the majority leader what the program will be for the rest of the week and for next week, insofar as he is able to state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state now the program for next week, but shall do so tomorrow.

The pending concurrent resolution is the last business for today.

Tomorrow there will be the joint session at which the President of Brazil will be the guest of the Congress. Following that will come the consideration of the Army pay-increase bill. If that bill is disposed of tomorrow, which I hope it will be, I expect to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, has told you, House Concurrent Resolution 62, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], provides for the creation of a Joint Committee on

Lobbying Activities, to consist of 14 Members, 7 from the House and 7 from the Senate. It is my understanding that there will be 4 Members from the majority party and 3 from the minority party named from each branch of the Congress.

The duties of the committee are set forth under three particular paragraphs or provisions of the resolution.

First, it shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation of all lobbying activities, intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

Second, and this particular provision, I might add, was written into the resolution by action of the Committee on Rules, which had original jurisdiction over this resolution, to make a full and complete investigation of all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

Third, the final duty and responsibility of this committee, if it is created, is to report from time to time to the Senate and to the House the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that in the Seventy-ninth Congress the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SABATH], introduced a resolution to investigate lobbying activities at that time. I supported that measure, but for some reason or other it was never acted upon by the Committee on Rules, and consequently no investigation was ever conducted.

I do not believe any fair-minded person in the Congress or out of the Congress can object to the proper kind of investigation of lobbying activities. We realize fully that in the minds of the public there is often some thing rather reprehensible connected with the words "lobby," or "lobbyist," or "lobbying." Yet, there are many good lobbyists. Under the rather complex economic system and governmental structure which we have created, perhaps it has become a necessity for different groups and organizations to have some representative spend a great deal of time keeping tab on the activities of the legislative branch of the Government. Since we passed the new Lobbying Act, there has been many questions raised as to just who, just what individuals and what organizations, are covered by that law, and who must register as lobbyists under the act. There are many individuals in and out of Washington who, of necessity, for their own protection, or for that of the business or industry in which they are engaged, must keep in rather close contact with the Congress and know exactly what is going on in a legislative way at the Capitol. Today any action taken by the Congress may vitally affect some business or industry or individual, as well as business or individual investments and incomes, and all of the varied activities of the business and industrial world. I want to express the hope that this committee, if authorized, will not engage in a witch hunt, or

act for the purpose of embarrassing any individual or any representative group in America that has a legitimate right to keep in contact with the activities of Congress and to present the views of themselves individually, or of the organizations they represent to the various Members of Congress, so long as their activities are conducted in the proper manner. Certainly I would not support legislation, such as this, if I thought for one moment that the committee created by this resolution was for the purpose of smearing anyone, or scaring anyone, or saying to an individual businessman or to any business concern: "You had better not go down to Washington, or write a letter to your Congressman, or see him at his home about anything that Congress may have before it which will affect your welfare, or you are liable to get in trouble. Neither do I want any American to be made to feel he is liable to have a committee down here in Congress yank him before it and smear him all over the lot because he may have the temerity to tell his Representative in the Congress of the United States what he thinks about pending legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that such a policy is not to be followed. I might add that we were given assurances in the Committee on Rules by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], the author of the legislation, that such is not his intent or purpose. Originally the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] had introduced a House resolution to establish a special House committee to carry on this investigation. Later there was a similar resolution introduced in the Senate for the naming of a Senate committee for the same purpose. This concurrent resolution is before us providing that a joint committee be created so that both bodies will be represented as a better method of procedure than having two separate committees looking into the same situation.

I mentioned a moment ago that the Committee on Rules, acting or sitting as a legislative committee, had adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to add a section to this resolution to authorize and require the joint committee, if it is created, to make a full and complete investigation of all activities of the various agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation. That amendment was adopted for a very, very pertinent reason. There are all sorts of lobbyists, when it comes right down to real lobbying activities, as you well know. I am rather convinced that the greatest lobbying I have ever seen, and the most influence I have ever felt in connection with legislation, since I have been a Member of Congress, has been by and from some of the bureaucratic agencies of our Federal Government. I say to you, we have no business attempting to put a halter on the activities of the representatives of private individuals, business, or industry in connection with legislation, unless we exert exactly

the same restraining influence upon the various agencies of government who are conducting lobbying activities, or conducting pressure campaigns with the people's money, in the attempt to influence the people's representatives in their legislative work in the Halls of Congress.

We have had several examples of that. We certainly had a plain example, as developed by the House Committee on Expenditures, in connection with the activities of some of the agencies of Government interested in putting across a certain public health program, or, should I speak frankly and say, socialized medicine. I personally experienced the pressure a Government agency could exert on a Member of Congress in connection with universal military training legislation before the last Congress.

Recently there has been a great deal of cloak-room gossip as to just how certain aviation contracts, if I might mention one illustration, have been obtained. I am not at all sure that the committee created under this resolution could go into the question of influence used in connection with obtaining such contracts from Government agencies, but that is another form of lobbying—although outside of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I suppose the gentleman also has in mind, although he has not expressed it, but I am sure that must be running through his mind, the reorganization bill as it passed the House and is now in conference. Certainly there has been one bureau or agency of Government that has been very powerful in retarding the passage of the legislation. There are many of us who are friends of that activity who are very much disturbed about the extent to which they have gone. I am referring to the United States Army engineers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. I do have in mind that particular activity, but I also have in mind the activities of a number of the other agencies of Government. Of course, you and I all know there is a law on the statute books which makes it a criminal offense for any agency of Government or for any public official to spend public funds for the purpose of influencing legislative action by the Congress. Yet that law has been violated time after time without any action being taken by our law-enforcement officers against those who have violated it. Yes, I do have those things in mind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been looking at section 3, subparagraph (1), of the resolution, which provides that it shall be the duty of the committee to make a full and complete investigation of all

lobbying activities, intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation. I do not find anywhere in the legislation any definition of the term "lobbying." I take it that would be broader than the activities of registered lobbyists, under the Congressional Reorganization Act. I could well interpret the use of the word there in its generally understood meaning to include not only the efforts of registered lobbyists, in the Government or out of the Government, in any capacity, who are engaging in what is commonly known as lobbying to influence the passage or prevent the passage of legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman from Indiana has brought up that particular point because I have been very much concerned over that same question. When this resolution was before the Committee on Rules, I suggested that we insert the word "paid" before "lobbying activities," so as to differentiate between those who come here representing themselves or their own private business and those persons who are receiving compensation for their activities as hired representatives of some organization attempting to influence legislation. I think that perhaps if that amendment were added to this legislation in conjunction with section 2 it would probably cover the practices we want to investigate without bothering any individual businessman or citizen who may come to Congress to express his individual opinion concerning his own efforts or industry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to hear the gentleman make the statement that he has just made because, speaking only for myself, I certainly would not want to be a party to anything that would undertake to deprive an American citizen, whatever his business, profession, or position, from petitioning the Congress for a redress of grievances or operating in his own interest in such a way as he sees fit in connection with Congress or the individual Members of Congress. In other words, what I am trying to say is that, in my opinion, we would not be doing the committee or the Congress a service if any such investigation as might be contemplated would be calculated to deprive the individual citizen of the right that he ought to have to make his voice heard and his influence felt in affairs of Government, so long as it is properly exercised.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. If the Constitution of the United States still means what I have always believed it to mean, I rather question that any congressional committee can long violate the rights of any individual to petition his Congress; and I doubt that the courts can or will permit any program or investigation to be carried on which will prevent an individual citizen from exercising the constitutional right to petition the Congress. I join with the gentleman in ex-

pressing the hope that this committee will not in any way attempt to invade the rights or privileges of the individual citizen to make known his position on legislative matters to his representatives in the Congress of the United States. After all, we do represent the people here, and they have not only the right, but the duty, to tell us what they think.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The purpose of the resolution is undoubtedly laudable. It would be very difficult to write language that would satisfy everybody everywhere in every way as we want them safeguarded, but I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the final analysis no law is better than its administration. Whether or not this resolution is effective and just, will depend upon the action of the personnel of the committee. I feel sure that the Speaker, who will name the membership from the House side, will take particular interest in this particular resolution and select a committee which will do that which the House wants done.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Michigan very much. It, of course, is my belief and my hope, that the personnel of this committee will be of such high character as the gentleman suggests. I am sure the Speaker on this body will name such a committee, and that without question the proper rights and privileges of all citizens will be protected during any investigation made by the committee. I hope, however, that before this debate is concluded, the sponsors of this legislation will give full assurances here on the floor to the House that the rights of all individuals will be properly safeguarded and protected, that there will be no attempt by the committee to in any way frighten, scare, or smear anyone, and that there will be a full and complete investigation of the activities of all Government agencies as well as of certain other organizations which seemingly have not paid any attention to our lobbying laws.

I hope there will be a careful investigation of all such activities, including the use of Government planes and transportation by those public officials who have been running around the country in the last few months busily engaged in building up pressure groups and pressure influence to control the actions of this Congress on several pieces of very important legislation. If that assurance is given, then I think we can all support the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. This is merely giving the power to the committee to make an investigation but not to report legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The committee may make recommendations only, and not report legislative bills.

Mr. SABATH. As I stated to the House before, I am positive that the Speaker will appoint only competent men.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have the same confidence in our great Speaker of the House that the gentleman has expressed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] need have no fear about any investigation controlled by the Democrats being fair. The Democratic Party is noted for its fairness, for its decency, and when we investigate we do not undertake to smear. We seek the facts.

During the last few years I was a minority member of three investigating committees and I could write a book on what happened. So the gentleman from Ohio need have no fear along those lines. He knows because he served as a member of the Committee on Expenditures during the last 2 years, on which committee I served also, and I think we were together on one other investigating committee. We Democrats always do the right thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The right thing in the wrong way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, of course, of one thing I am certain. I knew a bill was going through the other day although I was not on the floor. I knew it was going through, though. The gentleman was on the floor and did not know it was going through.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I just add that I think the Democrats do the right thing if we can get them to agree but it is like the situation today, it is a matter of getting the Democrats to agree on the right thing to do. The Republicans usually agree.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman that there is harmony on this matter. Of course, there is an amendment in there which means nothing. I refer to the investigation of Government departments, which would come under this resolution anyway. In addition, there is a criminal statute against the use of public funds for propaganda purposes. So my Republican friends may have the consolation of going along with this resolution because someone offered an amendment which was covered by the original resolution anyway. The amendment does not add anything because it is already covered by law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman in favor of this resolution or against it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I am the motivating influence for bringing it in.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps this is not needed because, as the gentleman says, we already have criminal law on the subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I referred to the amendment relating to the Federal agencies and departments. I said that was not necessary.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I hope what the gentleman said was facetious, because I am alarmed.

Does the gentleman mean that the section of this resolution referring to an investigation of the agencies of the Federal Government does not mean anything?

Mr. McCORMACK. It does not add anything to the resolution. I will withdraw the word "mean." It does not add anything to the resolution because the original resolution would cover it anyway.

Mr. VORYS. But the gentleman said that since it was covered by a criminal statute, that there would be no investigation in the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. VORYS. It is my hope that there will be an investigation as to whether criminal statutes are being violated by these agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that there would be no investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. My friend is generally so sound in his argument that I am rather concerned about his observation with reference to subsection 1. Subsection 1 would authorize this committee to make a full and complete investigation of all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation. Now, the gentleman has indicated that that is just so much window-dressing; that it has no vitality; that it has no force or effect, because there is now a criminal law covering the subject matter. May I call his attention to this, that the criminal law to which he refers, fixes a penalty for a violation of a statute, and the investigating, if any, must be done entirely by the law-enforcing agency of the Government. This provision would set up a congressional investigation; that is, there might be two investigations at the same time—one by the Department of Justice and the other by the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. What I said was this, that the original resolution would

cover the specific language put in by the Committee on Rules. I do not think there is any disagreement about what the gentleman from Michigan said and what I heretofore said in that respect. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that a joint committee is highly advisable. It is only right and proper that it should be a joint investigating committee. I know that there will be no smearing. This will be as serious an investigation as possible. I know that the Speaker will appoint, and the minority leader will recommend to him on the Republican side, outstanding Members. This is a very important matter, not only concerning whether there are any amendments to existing lobbying statutes necessary, but whether there is any improper lobbying going on. Lobbying, in itself, is all right; there is nothing wrong with that if it is done legitimately.

Furthermore, it must be clearly kept in mind that there is a distinction between lobbying and the right of petition. The right of petition is one of the four cornerstones of personal liberty. I do not think any of our businessmen or labor men should be denied the right of petition. My friend from Ohio talked about small business; I also include labor, small business, the farmers, and everyone else. They are not violating any law by writing us or seeing us or contacting us in any way, and certainly none of them need be scared. One thing is certain. According to the records there have been about \$40,000,000 paid in for some activities of this kind, and only \$9,000,000 per year have gone for salaries. It might be interesting to know where the other money went.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I intended to take 2 minutes on this subject, but the majority leader has expressed my views exactly, so I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny the need to do the job this resolution provides be done here in Congress. I compliment my colleague, a distinguished fellow member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] on his interest in this matter.

I rise merely to express the deep regret that, as we undertake this important assignment on lobbying activities, we do not follow better organizational procedures and insist that the regular standing committee of the House having jurisdiction over lobbying activities, which is the Committee on the Judiciary, take that up as a part of its regular work, even operating as a joint committee with the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the gentleman know that 43 percent of all the bills

introduced in this House this year have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and that we have our hands full?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very familiar with the work load the Committee on the Judiciary has. However, much of that is a private-bill load, which I believe they should divest themselves of by passing general legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nevertheless, the gentlemen on the Reorganization Committee put that work on us.

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed they did. They thought you would get rid of much of your work load of private immigration bills and private claims bills. Two or three things were missed in that Reorganization Act. We do think that if you would divest yourselves of much of that load of private bills, you would have more time for the general legislation.

Evidently the House is not going to try to follow this line of organization. I think it is unfortunate because when this committee does report its findings and recommends proposed changes in the Lobbying Act, it should have the powers of the standing committee to take that legislation right on through.

I again compliment my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. The original resolution provided for such an investigation by the House Judiciary Committee. It is obvious the Judiciary Committee is too overloaded at this time to take up this added work. But I cannot help but express regret that we are not sticking closer to organizational lines, because the setting up of every single special committee, whether it be a special committee of the House or a joint committee of the House and Senate, tends to destroy and tear down the jurisdictional lines of the regular standing committees of the Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mr. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I heard of this concurrent resolution for the first time this afternoon. I am sorry I cannot support this type of legislation. I am shocked at this measure. I have heard of bootleg whisky, and I have heard of bootleg cigarettes, and now, if this resolution is adopted, I am sure I am going to hear of bootleg lobbyists.

I wonder how we are going to touch the lobbyist who gets himself elected to a legislative body. What are we going to do with that one? The most vicious of all lobbyists is the selfish person who represents certain selfish interests and then gets himself or herself elected. That occurs not only in one legislative body but you and I know, since most of us have had experience in State legislatures, that it happens there, and maybe in the Congress of the United States.

If we pass this bill and vote "yes," we are casting aspersions upon our own intelligence, our own understanding, and our own integrity and courage, so I could not vote "yes" on this type of bill. If you and I, who have reached the national level of being Members of Congress, can-

not withstand the individual lobbyists and the group lobbyists and the pressure lobbyists, we should not be here. So I shall vote "no" if that opportunity comes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and ask if the gentleman would yield to me for a moment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the statement made by our distinguished friend, the majority leader, if it is not a fact that in the consideration of this legislation by the Committee on Rules, the sponsor of the legislation agreed that there was some question as to whether the measure, as originally drawn, would permit the proper study and investigation of the activities of the various agencies of the Federal Government in influencing legislation and that for that reason in order to make certain that the investigation could cover all attempts to influence legislation, the Committee on Rules, by unanimous vote, saw fit to adopt the amendment which added paragraph 2 to section 3 on page 2. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In reply to the gentleman from Ohio, I will say that that is my impression, to the best of my recollection of the discussions which took place in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I may seem somewhat unconventional as I proceed for a few moments, in that I shall not mention the name Republican or Democrat. This is a very, very difficult problem. The Congress embarked upon this legislative experiment 2 or 3 years ago with the best of intention. The best information that comes to us is that there is an element of uncertainty in the minds of thousands of people as to just what the present law means and how far it extends. Many persons in reading the law say "Well, it looks as if I will have to register." Other people, perfectly honest, reading the law, reach the conclusion that they do not have to register. I think this has never been construed with the degree of certainty that would be desirable. It is pretty hard to say just when a man is a typical lobbyist and when he is not. My conception of the meaning of the word "lobbyist" is that he is a person who is paid professionally to represent an interest. The interest in itself may be entirely legitimate. Yet, on the other hand, you may find a concern situated 500 miles from Washington that may say to its vice president or to its head, "We want you to go to Washington to talk to our Members of Congress and to our Senators and with others whom you may know, about certain legislation, and we will pay your expenses for going to Washington." Is he a professional lobbyist?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman for just a moment.

Mr. VORYS. The word "lobbying" is defined in the existing law. Would this

resolution not be defining it in terms of that definition?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Probably not.

Mr. VORYS. Has the Committee on Rules looked into that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Committee on Rules did its best to do justice to the problem. I cannot say to the gentleman from Ohio that the Committee on Rules knows all there is to know about it.

Just a moment ago I was giving my own impression of the public's impression of what a lobbyist is. There is a twilight zone and many people find themselves caught in it. There may be some evasion, and probably there is some evasion of the present law, or at least the spirit of the present law, which should be halted. On the other hand, there may be some other people who should not be under the provisions of this act, and who, leaning over backwards—if I may use that expression—would rather be regarded as coming under the provisions of the act than be under suspicion.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has said something about that paragraph which has to do with the investigation of the activities of governmental agencies. I have been in and out of Congress since 1915. I have seen, as you have all seen, the steady growth of the influence of what I may term the bureaucracy. It is inevitable as the Federal Government has assumed a new function, and it assumes three or four new functions in every session of Congress, that naturally those functions have to be administered by another agency created or already a part of the executive establishment. Their number has vastly increased. Their contracts with individual citizens all over the country have become more and more intimate. Obviously, they have become more and more influential with respect to legislation.

Reference has been made to the provision in the criminal statute which forbids the expenditure of Federal funds by any agent of the Federal Government for the purpose of influencing legislation. True, that law is on the statute books. Unfortunately, it has not been enforced in certain instances of which I have personal information. The committee to which reference has already been made, perhaps accidentally, stumbled upon some instances in which the traveling expenses and per diem allowances of Federal employees were paid out of the Federal Treasury for organizing meetings of citizens, scattered over the country, coaching speakers who were to address those meetings, supplying them with the material to be used in their speeches, and then arranging that a resolution should be passed in the public meeting petitioning the Congress to pass legislation for which the Federal agents were propagandizing. That is an absolute violation of the law. They were being paid by the Federal Government while doing that work.

The committee reported these violations to the Attorney General of the United States, with all the evidence in black and white, uncontrovertible; and no action was taken whatsoever. It may

be that the Attorney General thought the exposure of those incidents would stop their repetition, and in two departments of Government the exposure did stop repetition of that practice. One was in the War Department. In that case Secretary Royall was most square and fair about the whole thing. My impression was that he did not know what some of his subordinates were doing in the expenditure of Federal money. In any event, he ordered it stopped, and it was stopped immediately.

Perhaps the same result was achieved in the Federal Security Administration with respect to lobbying for socialized medicine, which was being paid for by the Federal Government, and carried on by Federal employees professionally.

In our discussions before the Rules Committee, the author of the resolution, in the best of good faith, gave us the impression that the objective of this resolution was to investigate the workings of the lobbying law of 1947, a part of the Congressional Reorganization Act, and the activities of this committee would be confined to a search-out in that field alone. When reminded that there were other lobbyists, and the most powerful of all of them was the bureaucrat, no objection was made to having the thing made perfectly clear.

I do not envy the job that this committee is going to do. It is going to be a very, very difficult one to actually draw the line of demarcation through that twilight zone which I mentioned a few moments ago, and which will define what we mean in the law, and which will be certain to eliminate from its provisions citizens of the United States who, under the Constitution of the United States, are entitled to petition their Congressmen and the Congress as a whole.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurred to me that the instance which the gentleman has cited, where actual violations of law were going on, might be corrected if they were currently going on and were reported to the Comptroller General. As I conceive the responsibility of a man like Lindsay Warren, and the feeling he has about the law, he would put a stop to the payment of salaries or expenses used for illegal purposes if he knew about it in time to do it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That may be true, but the Comptroller General is not a law-enforcement officer. He cannot bring suit against a violator. He might find ways of withholding his pay, but in the cases I have cited the pay has already gone out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand that; that is why I was wondering. Subparagraph 2, section 3, makes it the duty of this committee to report from time to time to the Senate and to the House of Representatives the results of this study and investigation. The General Accounting Office, of course, is the agency of the Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I assume that the committee, should it desire to do so,

could call the attention of the Comptroller General to any irregularity it had unearthed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the members of the committee for their very deliberate discussion of this resolution and for reporting this measure at this time. As has been stated here, the intent and purpose of a committee of this character would be entirely objective in nature; and, as the gentleman from New York has stated, it is no easy task. I am certain that the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, should the Senate also see fit to adopt this measure, will appoint men of high character, men who would approach the subject dispassionately, men who want to seek out and bring about a reasonable solution to a problem that has caused a lot of doubt and confusion.

Many public-relations firms engaged in legitimate educational activities have asked their legal counsel for opinions as to whether or not they could be compelled to register under the terms of the Lobbying Act of 1946, as to whether or not their activities were to be included; and in many cases they were advised not to. Referring then to the Department of Justice for an interpretation and opinion relative to the same activities the Department has advised them that they were included and that they had better comply with the law; and they have done so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder whether it has been the experience of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as it has been mine and that of almost every other Member of this Congress, I am sure, that constituents have contacted us to inquire as to their rights under this law and as to whether or not they would have to register if they came here as a member, perhaps, of an association when other members of the same association were coming to tell their own Members of Congress what effect certain legislation would have on their business. Has the gentleman had that experience?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have; and I am sure every Member of Congress has had the same type of queries from various business groups.

Mr. Speaker, at the behest of many who have approached me on the subject I first introduced a House resolution; and then, as has been stated by a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, their work load was such that it would be rather difficult for that committee to take on a problem as great in scope as this problem really is.

There is no doubt there is a shadow area or twilight zone. If we can reduce the doubt and confusion to some degree, and clarify and amplify, and augment

the law from basis of the past 3 years of experience we have had under the Lobbying Act of 1946, I am certain that the over-all objectiveness of this committee will be of great worth to the Members of the House.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he feels that this committee should be limited solely to an investigation of lobbying as defined in the Lobbying Act, or whether he feels that it was broader and would cover the popular and dictionary definition so that the gentleman's committee would make a study of the activities intended to encourage or retard legislation on the basis of such activities with which the Congress should be familiar, and as to whether more legislation is needed in addition to merely clarifying the present lobbying law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman from Ohio that the present terminology of the Registration of Lobbying Activities Act passed in 1946 by the Seventy-ninth Congress, Public Law 601, does define to a degree, but as has been stated, there is still doubt and confusion as to how far that would go. We have had 3 years of experience under that act and I believe that the committee so chosen may recommend to the proper committee of the House for augmentation and simplification, if that is at all possible, and clarification of the terminology that now exists. It is with that thought and purpose in mind that such an investigation of this nature has been requested and I assure the Members that if I become a member of this committee all business groups, labor groups, consumer groups, or any other special-interest groups, as well as any Federal agencies, will be treated with due respect.

It is certainly not my intent that this committee would indulge in any "muck-raking" campaign.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, all of you who have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania and all of you who have served with him during the years he has been a Member of Congress I am sure recognize the fact that he is a fair-minded, sincere gentleman, and that if he becomes chairman of this committee, as I believe he will, there will be a fair investigation, as I said before.

This committee has no power to legislate. It has only the power to investigate, and report thereon.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will agree the committee also has the power to recommend legislation?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, it will have the power to recommend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the proper legislative committee having jurisdiction will take control of any recommendation that is made?

Mr. SABATH. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that this legislation is needed. Originally the resolution did not include the second paragraph that states: "to make full and complete investigation of all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence," but I agreed to that amendment because I believe that two wrongs do not make a right. All lobbying on the part of Government departments or individuals which tends to influence the action of this House should be investigated and stopped. By this I do not mean to infer that private individuals or businessmen should be deprived of their right to petition Congress or appeal and espouse their viewpoints and recommendations on various legislation. At the same time, I feel that this committee will clarify the doubt expressed by the definition and meaning of the term "lobby" or "lobbyist" to the end that the committee will, in its report, adequately define the term "lobby" and "lobbyist" so that there can be no misunderstanding thereon. I personally believe the term should apply to all individuals or groups of individuals who are paid or hired to stop or promote legislation by way of influencing Congressmen. In fact, the definition should be broadened to include lobbyists connected with the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It should be clearly stated—and I would like to get the gentleman's reaction—for the Record that by the insertion of that language it is not intended and it does not in any way take away jurisdiction from the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. Is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. I am satisfied the gentleman is correct, as usual.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is within the jurisdiction of that committee, of which my very valued friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was chairman the last 2 years. It certainly carried on any number of investigations of departments and agencies. I was a member of several subcommittees and they kept me busy all the time. It is distinctly understood that that language in no way is intended to take away any of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures; is that right?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is right as always.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that in line 25, page 2, and in line 5 on page 3, the words "subpena" and "subpenas" are misspelled. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be instructed to correct the spelling of those words.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 17, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2632. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3762. An act to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," and title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

627. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 30. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to their service; without amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Lobbying Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1181. An act to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1219. An act removing certain restrictions and conditions imposed by section 2 of the act of May 27, 1936, on certain of the lands conveyed by such act to the city of Charleston, S. C.; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1270. An act to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAVENNER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 263. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Orange, Calif., a perpetual easement for the maintenance and operation of a public highway, and to grant to the Irvine Co., a corporation, a perpetual easement for the maintenance, operation, and use of a water pipe line, in the vicinity of the naval air base, Santa Ana, Orange County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2418. A bill to authorize restocking, propagation, and conservation of game in the Elkin Field Reservation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3155. A bill to amend Public Law 885, Eightieth Congress, chapter 813, second session; with an amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4007. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947; with an amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4384. A bill to provide for the appointment of female doctors and specialists in the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 779. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; with an amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. First intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 627).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1499. A bill for the relief of John K. Jackson; without amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 41. An act for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.; without amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 42. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; without amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 146. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 147. An act for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull; without amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 165. An act for the relief of William F. Thomas; without amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 189. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken; without amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 191. An act for the relief of Louis J. Waline; without amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 408. An act for the relief of the estate of William E. O'Brien; without amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 782. An act for the relief of William S. Meany; without amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 948. An act for the relief of Mickey Baine; without amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4094. A bill for the relief of Bunge North-American Grain Corp., the Corporacion Argentina de Productores de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of the estate of James B. Stirling, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of Dolan Calcutt; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum; without amendment (Rept. No. 609).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 835. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to James Madison Burton; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 836. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 837. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Irene Scott Bassett; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1036. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lavantia Pearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1037. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Virginia Pearson; without amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4749. A bill to remove the requirement of residence in the District of Columbia for membership on the Commission on Mental Health; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 4750. A bill to provide for the location of mining claims by geological and geophysical prospecting methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4751. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4752. A bill providing for the disposition of 50 percent of the grazing receipts from certain public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4754. A bill to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 4755. A bill to authorize the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 4756. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4757. A bill to reclassify postmasters, assistant postmasters, and other positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 4758. A bill to provide for a branch post-office building in Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4759. A bill to provide for the construction of an addition to the main post-office building in Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4760. A bill to provide that small business shall receive a fair share of Government procurements; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 4761. A bill to provide a more satisfactory program of benefits relating to active service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4762. A bill to amend title 25, section 247, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4763. A bill to amend Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress, section 624; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4764. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize Congress to establish daylight-saving time for any year by concurrent resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 4765. A bill relating to full-time institutional trade and industrial training for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4766. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4767. A bill to clarify the active-duty status of certain officers of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4768. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce, to strengthen the anti-trust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement, and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 4769. A bill to extend the benefits of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to certain citizens of Guam captured at Wake Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4770. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and Local Governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4771. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of \$100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals" (Pub. Law 830, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 4772. A bill to provide a 40-hour week for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4773. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BREEN:

H. R. 4774. A bill to authorize the interment of Chaplain and Mrs. William R. Hughes in the Veterans' Administration cemetery at Dayton, Ohio; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation establishing National Temperance Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to establish the Near East Survey Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4775. A bill for the relief of Harold L. Corzett, commander, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4776. A bill for the relief of Satirios Christos Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4777. A bill for the relief of J. D. Lecky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4778. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 4779. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4780. A bill for the relief of Edgar A. Taylor, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4781. A bill for the relief of Veronica Jolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

894. By Mr. Lecompte: Petition of Paul S. Beer, druggist, and other citizens of Centerville, Iowa, urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

895. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, fountain of our being, light of all our seeing; for the beauty of the earth, robed in the blooming garb of spring and for the tint of the tiniest flower, we raise our hymn of morning praise. As in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence, wilt Thou refresh our souls and restore our faith.

As this day with warm friendship we welcome the head of a great nation of the southern continent, may this neighborly handclasp between two democracies of our hemisphere be a symbol of closer cooperation and deeper understanding. Together, as colleagues, believing in the dignity of the individual, may we plan wisely and well for the common welfare of our peoples and for the peace of the whole world. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. RUSSELL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 18, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3334. An act to grant the consent of the United States to the Pecos River compact; and

H. R. 3825. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 62) creating a Joint Committee on Lobbying Activities, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.